

Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Convention
the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of
the United States, December 28, 1909.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1905-06.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, United States Military Academy, West Point,
N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

Professor William L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Chancellor Frank Strong, University of Kansas.
President Herbert Welch, Ohio Wesleyan University.
Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College.

1906-07.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, United States Military Academy, West Point,
N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Director C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.
Professor C. E. St. John, Oberlin College.
Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College.

1907-08.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A., Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

SECRETARY.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.

TREASURER.

Professor W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

First District, Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
Second District, Professor H. A. Peck, Syracuse University.
Third District, Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Fourth District, Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
Fifth District, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
Sixth District, Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

1908-09.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A., Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor C. W. Savage, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

First District, Professor Paul C. Phillips, Amherst College.
Second District, Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College.
Third District, Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University.
Fourth District, Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
Fifth District, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
Sixth District, Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

1909-10.

PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A., Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

VICE PRESIDENT.

Professor R. Tait McKenzie, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia,
Pa.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(In addition to president and secretary, *ex officio*.)

First District, Professor Fred W. Marvel, Brown University.
 Second District, Director W. N. Golden, Pennsy... College.
 Third District, Professor A. H. Patterson, University of North Carolina.
 Fourth District, Professor C. W. Savage, Oberlin College.
 Fifth District, Professor S. W. Beyer, Iowa State College.
 Sixth District, Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

ROLL OF MEMBERS.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., William H. Crawford, D. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., George Harris, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Bates College, Lewiston, Me., George C. Chase, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Brown University, Providence, R. I., William Herbert Perry Faunce, D. D.,
 LL. D., President.
 Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., John H. Harris, LL. D., President.
 Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., Donald J. Cowling, D. D., President.
 Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, Charles S. Howe, Ph. D.,
 Sc. D., President.
 Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., Elmer B. Bryan, President.
 College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y., John H. Finley,
 LL. D., President.
 Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Nicholas M. Butler, Ph. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., Ernest F. Nichols, LL. D., President.
 Delaware College, Newark, Del., George A. Harter, Ph. D., President.
 Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Rev. Emory W. Hunt, D. D.,
 President.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., George E. Reed, S. T. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Rev. Henry H. Apple,
 D. D., President.
 George Washington University, Washington, D. C., Charles W. Needham,
 LL. D., President.
 Grove City College, Grove City, Pa., Rev. I. C. Ketler, Ph. D., D. D.,
 President.
 Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., Abbott Lawrence Lowell, LL. D., ~~✗~~ 7
 President.
 Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., Isaac Sharpless, Sc. D., LL. D.,
 L. H. D., President.
 Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., William L. Bryan, Ph. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Albert B. Storms, D. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, Rev. W. F. Peirce, L. H. D., President.
 Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., Rev. E. D. Warfield, D. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Henry S. Drinker, M. E., LL. D.,
 President.

- Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Guy P. Benton, D. D., LL. D., President.
 Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., John A. W. Haas, D. D., President.
 New York University, New York, N. Y., H. M. MacCracken, D. D., LL. D.,
 Chancellor.
 Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N. Y., Rev. Edward J. Walsh, C. M.,
 President.
 North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, West Raleigh,
 N. C., Daniel H. Hill, Litt. D., President.
 Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Abram W. Harris, Sc. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., Charles H. Spooner, LL. D., President.
 Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Rev. Henry C. King, D. D., President.
 Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, William O. Thompson, D. D.,
 LL. D., President.
 Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Rev. Herbert Welch, D. D.,
 LL. D., President.
 Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., Edwin E. Sparks, Ph. D.,
 LL. D., President.
 Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Charles M. Pratt, A. M., President.
 Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., Rev. W. H. S. Demarest, D. D.,
 President.
 Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J., Rev. James F. Mooney, D. D.,
 President.
 State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, George E. MacLean, LL. D.,
 President.
 Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., A. C. Humphreys, Sc. D.,
 LL. D., President.
 Swarthmore College, Swarthmore Pa., Joseph Swain, M. S., LL. D.,
 President.
 Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Rev. J. R. Day, S. T. D., D. C. L.,
 LL. D., Chancellor.
 Tufts College, Medford, Mass., Frederick W. Hamilton, D. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 Union University, Schenectady, N. Y., Rev. C. Richmond, D. D., President.
 United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Col. H. L. Scott,
 U. S. A., Superintendent.
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark., John N. Tillman, LL. D.,
 President.
 University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Harry P. Judson, LL. D., President.
 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., James H. Baker, M. A., LL. D.,
 President.
 University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, Frank Strong, Ph. D., LL. D.,
 Chancellor.
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Cyrus Northrop, LL. D.,
 President.
 University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss., Andrew A. Kincannon, LL. D.,
 President.
 University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Albert R. Hill, Ph. D., LL. D.,
 President.
 University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., Samuel Avery, Ph. D., Chancellor.
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Francis P. Venable,
 Ph. D., Sc. D., LL. D., President.
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. Charles C. Harrison, LL. D.,
 Provost.
 University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Pa., Samuel B. McCormick, D. D.,
 LL. D., Chancellor.
 University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Rush Rhees, D. D., LL. D.,
 President.

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., Brown Ayres, Ph. D., LL. D.,
President.
University of Texas, Austin, Texas, Sidney E. Mezes, Ph. D., President.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., Edwin A. Alderman, D. C. L.,
LL. D., President.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, Ph. D., D. C. L.,
LL. D., Chancellor.
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., Rev. James D. Moffat,
D. D., LL. D., President.
Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., William Arnold Shanklin,
L. H. D., LL. D., President.
Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa., Robert McW. Russell, D. D.,
LL. D., President.
West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., D. B. Purinton, Ph. D.,
LL. D., President.
Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Harry A. Garfield, LL. D.,
President.
Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, Charles G. Heckert, D. D.,
President.

PROCEEDINGS.

The Fourth Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States met pursuant to the call of the executive committee, at the Murray Hill Hotel, New York City, Tuesday, December 28, 1909, at 10 a.m.

President Palmer E. Pierce was in the chair.

The roll was called and the following were recorded in attendance:

1. Accredited delegates representing institutions duly enrolled as members of the Association:

President Edwin A. Alderman, University of Virginia.
Dr. James A. Babbitt, Haverford College.
Capt. Charles M. Barber, Norwich University.
Professor J. W. Bell, University of Mississippi.
Professor Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College.
Professor S. W. Beyer, Iowa State College.
Professor Hugo Bezdek, University of Arkansas.
Professor J. Thompson Brown, University of Tennessee.
Mr. W. W. Campbell, Westminster College.
Professor H. G. Chase, Tufts College.
Director A. W. Chez, West Virginia University.
Professor R. G. Clapp, University of Nebraska.
Professor R. S. Colwell, Denison College.
Director F. E. Craver, Dickinson College.
Director John A. Davis, Pratt Institute.
Professor E. B. Delabarre, Brown University.
Professor G. M. Forbes, University of Rochester.
Mr. W. F. Garcelon, Harvard University.
Director W. N. Golden, Pennsylvania State College.
Professor C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.
Mr. F. B. Hill, Carleton College.
Professor George A. Hoadley, Swarthmore College.

Professor C. E. Houghton, New York University.
 Professor E. C. Huntington, Colgate University.
 Mr. Morland King, Union University.
 Professor Craven Laycock, Dartmouth College.
 Professor Edwin Lee, Allegheny College.
 Dr. Samuel B. Linhart, University of Pittsburg.
 Professor H. L. McBain, George Washington University.
 Professor R. Tait McKenzie, University of Pennsylvania.
 Dr. George L. Meylan, Columbia University.
 President J. D. Moffat, Washington and Jefferson College.
 Dean F. W. Moore, Vanderbilt University.
 Director James Naismith, University of Kansas.
 Capt. W. F. Nesbitt, U. S. Military Academy.
 Professor F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.
 Professor A. H. Patterson, University of North Carolina.
 Professor Henry A. Peck, Syracuse University.
 Professor Paul C. Phillips, Amherst College.
 Mr. R. D. Purinton, Bates College.
 Professor W. H. Reese, Muhlenburg College.
 Professor W. C. Riddick, North Carolina College of Agriculture and
 Mechanic Arts.
 Director L. W. St. John, Ohio Wesleyan University.
 Professor C. W. Savage, Oberlin College.
 Dr. F. L. Sevenoak, Stevens Institute of Technology.
 Director James M. Sheldon, Indiana University.
 Professor C. A. Short, Delaware College.
 Professor A. A. Stagg, University of Chicago.
 Professor T. A. Storey, College of the City of New York.
 Professor C. L. Thornburg, Lehigh University.
 Professor H. D. Wild, Williams College.
 Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.
 Professor H. S. Wingert, Ohio State University.

2. Visiting delegates from institutions not members of the Association, and additional delegate representatives from institutions represented by accredited delegates:

Mr. G. B. Affleck, Y. M. C. A. Training School, Springfield, Mass.
 Director F. H. Cann, New York University.
 Mr. C. C. Cordova, Washington and Tusculum College.
 President W. H. Crawford, Intercollegiate Athletic Association of Western
 Pennsylvania and West Virginia.
 Professor C. I. Freeman, Denison College.
 Mr. Percy B. Goodell, Occidental College.
 Professor Gordon, U. S. Military Academy.
 Mr. E. K. Hall, Dartmouth College.
 Hon. T. E. Hodges, West Virginia University.
 Professor P. B. Kennedy, Beloit College.
 Mr. Thomas Kirby, Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
 Mr. A. M. Kzllander, Pratt Institute.
 Dr. W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia.
 Professor G. H. Lamson, Jr., Connecticut Agricultural College.
 Col. C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy.
 Dr. J. H. McCurdy, Y. M. C. A. Training School.
 Professor W. W. McGilton, Middlebury College.
 Professor F. W. Marvel, Brown University.
 Professor C. L. Maxcy, Williams College.
 Professor H. A. Miller, Olivet College.

Professor H. S. Pettit, Adelphi College.
 Dr. Pond, Stevens Institute of Technology.
 Mr. Albert W. Putnam, Columbia University.
 Dr. J. E. Raycroft, University of Chicago.
 Professor P. L. Reynolds, Massachusetts Agricultural College.
 Mr. H. A. Ross, Phillips-Exeter Academy.
 Professor F. A. Rousseau, S. J., Boston College and College of the Holy Cross.
 Dr. P. M. Seixas, New York Military Academy.
 Professor St. G. L. Sioussat, University of the South.
 Professor N. H. Tyler, Rhode Island State College.
 Dr. Carl Williams, University of Pennsylvania.
 Dr. E. von den Steinen, Western Reserve University.

The president appointed as a committee on credentials: Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., of Rutgers College, Prof. E. C. Huntington of Colgate University, and Prof. Craven Laycock of Dartmouth College.

The president appointed as a nominating committee: Prof. F. W. Nicolson of Wesleyan University, secretary, Dean F. W. Moore of Vanderbilt University, Prof. R. Tait McKenzie of the University of Pennsylvania, Prof. Howard Opdyke of Union University, Prof. R. G. Clapp of the University of Nebraska, Director James Naismith of the University of Kansas, and Prof. C. W. Savage of Oberlin College.

On recommendation of the executive committee, the following institutions, having applied for membership and paid their dues, were elected members of the Association: Brown University, Delaware College, Indiana University, University of Tennessee, Bates College, Harvard University, Norwich University, Columbia University, University of Arkansas, Carleton College, University of Mississippi and the College of the City of New York.

Formal papers were then presented as follows:

"The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States." President Palmer E. Pierce. (See page 29.)

"The Function of College Athletics." Chancellor J. R. Day, Syracuse University. (See page 34.)

"Competition in College Athletics." Dr. D. A. Sargent, Harvard University. (See page 43.)

"The Essential Factors in the Control of Intercollegiate Athletics." Dr. J. H. McCurdy, Y. M. C. A. Training School, Springfield, Mass. (See page 55.)

"Courtesy and Sportsmanship in Intercollegiate Athletics." Prof. Thomas F. Moran, Purdue University. (See page 62.)

After Chancellor Day's address, a formal vote of thanks was tendered him by the Association, and later in the session the president, on behalf of the Association, thanked the other speakers for their very interesting and valuable papers.

An adjournment for luncheon was taken at one o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association reassembled at 2.15 p.m.

The committee on credentials reported that they had found the proper papers in the cases of all the accredited delegates given in the foregoing list.

The secretary reported a recommendation of the executive committee to the effect that an institution whose dues are unpaid for two years should receive notice from the secretary that unless the dues are paid before the next annual meeting the executive committee will recommend to the Association that the name of the institution be dropped from the roll of members. The recommendation of the executive committee was adopted.

The treasurer presented his annual report, showing a balance on hand of \$370, with all bills paid.

REPORTS FROM DISTRICTS.

Reports were received from the district representatives as follows:

FIRST DISTRICT.

PROF. PAUL C. PHILLIPS, AMHERST COLLEGE.

The number of members in this Association has increased during the past year from six to ten by the admission of Harvard, Brown, Bates and Norwich. Several other colleges have expressed their sympathy with the purpose and methods of the organization and their expectation of joining in the near future, either individually or by the group method allowed under our present constitution.

1. During the past year there has been on the whole a tendency toward a stricter enforcement of the eligibility rules, both those relating to amateur and scholastic standing.

2. Your representative has been able to learn of no additions to or modifications of the eligibility code worthy of mention either concertedly or by individual institutions, but several colleges report additions to the scholastic regulations in the interest of greater strictness.

3. The most noteworthy progress toward uniformity in athletic matters has been made through the "Association of New England Colleges for Conference on Athletics." This association had its second annual meeting May 14, 1909, with nineteen colleges represented. The topics considered were: summer baseball, sportsmanship at games, length of schedules,

professional coaching, and the training table. The following statistics were compiled as the result of the meeting:

SUMMER BASEBALL: Allowed by ten colleges, prohibited by six. Effect of summer baseball on athletics where allowed: Good 3, fairly good 1, not injurious 1, not serious 1, not very good 1, no reply 2. Effect where not allowed: Not satisfactory 3, good 1, no reply 2. Enforcement of rules regarding summer baseball: Strict 2, quite strict 2, fairly strict 2. Tendency toward prohibition 2, toward restrictions 1, satisfied 4, no reply 3. Tendency toward greater strictness of enforcement 1, possibly toward greater strictness 1, no opinion 4. B.B.

As a result of its work on summer baseball the sub-committee did not deem it wise to recommend a common basis of action but instead a more thorough study of the question by faculties and athletic boards and the education of the students into sympathy with amateurism.

TRAINING TABLES: In football 10 colleges reported a training table and 9 no table; in baseball 4 had a table and 15 none, and in track 7 had a table and 12 had none.

The most marked tendencies manifested in this district the past year are toward: (a) Increase of intra-mural sports and the generalization of athletics, seen in the property being purchased and the increase in non-intercollegiate athletics. (b) Gradual reduction in number of intercollegiate contests. This has become a settled policy with several colleges. (c) Restrictions in or abolition of the training tables, especially that in football.

SECOND DISTRICT.

PROF. LOUIS BEVIER, JR., RUTGERS COLLEGE.

The past year has shown a marked growth of the influence of this Association in the Middle States and Maryland. This is indicated in many ways, of which three may here be considered:

1. In the renewed interest centering about football a more direct appeal is made than ever to this Association to obtain needed reforms. The colleges and universities feel that here is an agency which may use its organized forces to a specific end, and may hold its agents directly accountable for results, being itself ultimately held responsible. When in 1905 the cry of "mend football or end it" became popular, no one knew where to turn to give practical effect to the popular wish. This Association grew out of that condition. Now when the same cry is so generally heard, everyone assumes as a matter of course

that a representative body like this is capable of giving authoritative direction to the desire of public opinion.

2. The growth of our influence is manifested again in the increase of membership. From the very outset the number of institutions in the Middle States and Maryland enrolled as members was greater than in any other division of the country. During the past year this membership has been increased by the addition of Columbia, the College of the City of New York, and Delaware to the roll, so that of a total membership of sixty-seven, the Middle States and Maryland furnish thirty at the present time.

3. The effect of the work we are doing is further shown by the more active assumption of responsibility for athletics by faculties, and a more real control than ever before. A collection of the eligibility rules nominally in force shows great diversity, but in general the purpose to adopt the standards of this Association is unmistakable. The legislation enacted by faculties varies from the vague statement that "we use the eligibility rules of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States" to a detailed code embodying these principles and providing for their complete enforcement.

Before the problem of athletics in their relation to the true educational work of the colleges and universities can be in any large measure solved, the delusion must pass that eligibility rules or any other laws are or can be made self-enacting. Here is where the greatest lack exists in this part of the country. Many faculties seem to think still that their duty is done when a proper eligibility code is written in their books, and allow the students to go on as before without practical tests as to whether or not the rules are observed.

What is most needed is the formation of local leagues between allied institutions for the comparison of methods, and exchange of ideas. This work has scarcely yet begun.

THIRD DISTRICT.

PROF. W. L. DUDLEY, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

The athletic conditions in the colleges of the South are, on the whole, very good. All of the institutions of any importance belong to some intercollegiate athletic association or have faculty rules which, in a measure, serve the purpose. The rules of the various associations and of the few colleges not in any association, differ widely on many points of eligibility, but they all aim at the exclusion of professionalism. None of the associations in the South attempt at the present time to fix any scholarship standard

for members of teams, but many of the colleges have adopted such standards with the result that the athletic as well as the academic performances of athletes in those institutions have shown a marked improvement.

There is nothing of especial interest to report concerning baseball, basket ball, or track and field athletics in the South, but football is attracting wide attention in my district as is the case elsewhere in the United States. There have not been an unusual number of accidents in football in this district during the past season, but the unfortunate death of one player on a southern team has given rise to much comment and feeling against the game as now played. There is some talk of legislative enactment against football in one or two of the southern states.

At the annual meeting of the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association, held at the University of Mississippi on December 17 and 18, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

Resolved, First, that a committee of five members, of which the president of this Association shall be the chairman, be appointed by the president, to be known as the committee on football rules.

Resolved, Second, that it shall be the duty of this committee to recommend changes of the rules to the national football rules committee, and immediately after the meeting of the said rules committee, to take under advisement and subject to close scrutiny any changes which may be made in the football rules by the said national rules committee, with a view to ascertaining whether such changes will effectually eliminate mass plays.

Resolved, Third, that in case the committee finds that the changes made in the rules for football, if they are made, are of doubtful efficiency in finally and decisively eliminating all mass plays from the game, then it shall be the duty of the said committee on football rules to formulate rules which will effectually do away with mass plays, which rules they shall submit to the executive committee.

Resolved, Fourth, that, upon approval by the executive committee of the amendments of the football rules proposed by the committee on football rules, all colleges in this Association shall be required to conform to such amended rules, and will be prohibited from playing with any college not a member of this Association, which does not conform to said amendments.

The committee appointed in accordance with the above resolutions consists of myself as chairman, Dr. John Morris of the University of Georgia, Prof. W. M. Riggs of Clemson College, S. C., Rev. Henry D. Phillips of LaGrange, Ga., and Mr. George P. Butler of the Richmond Academy, Augusta, Ga.

It is proposed that this committee meet in Atlanta in January with all of the football experts and coaches in the South, who will be invited to attend the conference. At this meeting the whole situation will be discussed and modifications to the existing football rules will be formulated and forwarded to the National Football Rules Committee as suggestions to them. It is proposed to coöperate with the national committee and thus avoid the necessity for a separate set of rules, if possible. I am sure

this can be accomplished, for I know that the national committee will gladly welcome suggestions as it has done in the past, and that it will do everything possible to make the game satisfactory.

The Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association also passed a memorial to the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, which I transmit herewith:

Realizing that most of the serious accidents occur in games where the rivalry is very intense, where young players are spurred on by an excited crowd of spectators and thus urged to overexert themselves through a feeling of pride and patriotism for their school, the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the S. I. A. A. recommend to the colleges and schools that no student under the age of sixteen years be permitted to take part in any intercollegiate or interscholastic game of football.

I am glad to report that the representatives of several southern colleges have informed me that it is their intention to have their respective institutions join the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States at this meeting.

FOURTH DISTRICT.

PROF. A. A. STAGG, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Your representative for the Fourth District desires to report some progress in the securing of members to the Association. It is a pleasure to state that Indiana University, a member of the Chicago Conference, has joined the Association. Five of the eight universities composing the Conference are now enrolled as members of the Association, including the University of Minnesota, the University of Iowa, Northwestern University, Indiana University, and the University of Chicago. Your representative has made several efforts to secure the membership of the University of Wisconsin, the University of Illinois and Purdue University. Two of these have definitely expressed interest in the Association and its work, and I believe eventually will become members. I have also made several efforts to enlist the interest of the small colleges of Michigan and Minnesota and Illinois in joining the Association, but so far as I know without avail. There has been a steady and definite growth among the students, faculty and public of the Fourth District in the development of the amateur spirit and of intercollegiate athletic courtesy. The Chicago Conference, which has now been in existence for thirteen years, has never been so strong as it is at the present, and there is a very harmonious spirit existing between its members to develop and preserve the best ideals in all their intercollegiate relations.

The Fourth District, which includes the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, is in pretty good shape as regards

the appreciation and understanding of the spirit of intercollegiate amateur sport. The Chicago Conference, which was established in 1896, set the pace for wise regulation of intercollegiate athletics in the Middle West. The effect of the Conference regulations proved so good that other sections patterned after the Conference and adopted some of these regulations entirely and others in a modified form. The universities and colleges of Ohio in particular organized along similar lines, and for several years have been regulating and managing the intercollegiate athletics of the leading colleges of the state in a most beneficial manner. Beyond the Mississippi the state universities of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and the State Agricultural College at Ames, Iowa, along with Drake University and Washington University, two years ago organized the Missouri Valley Conference along lines similar to the so-called "Big Eight" Conference. The effect has been that practically the whole West, from the boundaries of New York and Pennsylvania north of the Ohio River as far west as Colorado and Wyoming, covering a distance almost one thousand miles north and south and fourteen hundred miles east and west, and including twenty-six universities and over forty thousand students, is living under practically the same regulations, and is uniting in pushing the best ideals of intercollegiate amateur sport. Besides this there are four distinct groups of smaller institutions, namely, in the states of Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois and Iowa, which have adopted most of the Conference regulations. There is a distinct spirit of coöperation existing between the three above-mentioned Conferences which has shown itself on a number of occasions in the use which the Ohio Conference and the Missouri Valley Conference have made of Prof. C. A. Waldo, of Washington University, who for more than ten years has been the arbitrator for the so-called "Big Eight" Conference. Last November the Missouri Valley Conference sent a delegation of two of its professors to the Chicago Conference with a request for coöperation in a certain matter which needed adjustment, and the Chicago Conference voted unanimously to coöperate with the Missouri Valley Conference. This spirit of coöperation which governs the intercollegiate athletics of the big institutions of the whole Middle West promises valuable results and prophesies well for the future of that vast region.

FIFTH DISTRICT.

DR. H. L. WILLIAMS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

[The report from this district was not presented in written form and the secretary has been unable to secure a digest of it.]

SIXTH DISTRICT.

PROF. C. W. HETHERINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

The sixth district shows some marked changes during the last year, some questionable, some positively good.

The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the Southwest dissolved during the spring. Of the old members of this organization, Texas University has the reputation of maintaining proper standards. Grave charges of flagrant violations were brought against one of the state institutions in Texas. Other institutions of this organization vary greatly in standards.

In the northern section of the district, the Missouri Valley Conference of Faculty Representatives, with its seven members, is the dominating influence. This organization covers Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas and Missouri, and its influence extends into Arkansas and Oklahoma as Missouri Valley Conference members are not allowed to play non-conference institutions except under conference rules. This Conference during the last year has made material progress both in regulations and discipline. Regulations were adopted that harmonized the Missouri Valley Conference with the Intercollegiate or Chicago Conference. In the future students, to compete in intercollegiate contests, must not only have passed full regular entrance requirements, have been in residence one year and passed one year's college work, but they will be barred after graduation, thus confining competition to the Sophomore, Junior and Senior years. Regulations fixing a limit to all schedules were also adopted. Some deviations from the spirit of the regulations this year brought out the disciplinary powers of the Conference. In this power there is hope for greater uniformity and less suspicion. The success and influence of this Conference seems to be the hope for higher standards in the whole sixth district.

Perhaps the most striking item of interest in the district is the stronger symptoms of progress towards the distinctively western method of organizing all athletic activities under the department of physical education with a faculty director. This progress comes from the success of the organization and the growing sense of responsibility on the part of university authorities. Little hope may be entertained for better things in athletics until college faculties fulfill the functions of educators, take an interest in the lives of their students, and until educators with sense and moral earnestness and backbone are put in charge of students as leaders and then supported in a stand for principles against the attacks of the partisan and sporty element. The problem of athletics does not center in the students or the alumni, but in the faculty, and here, further, on whether the faculty will look into the functions

and influences of athletics, and whether they will see that these functions are realized. There is no hope for progress in the public sentiment of students except by strong united leadership on the part of the faculty. Any tendency in this direction is hopeful.

OTHER COMMITTEE REPORTS.

Various other committee reports were presented as follows:

I. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRACK ATHLETICS.

Your committee on track and field athletics has found that there are only slight differences between the rules of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of Amateur Athletes of America, the New England Intercollegiate Athletic Association, the Intercollegiate Conference Athletic Association, and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association, but your committee is of the opinion: 1. That there is need for nationalizing the intercollegiate rules governing the conduct of the different events in track and field athletics; 2. That this Association should become responsible for preserving and publishing the intercollegiate records of its members.

Therefore your committee recommends that a committee of three be appointed by the president to formulate a set of rules on track and field athletics which may be used by the members of this Association in track and field meets and cross-country runs.

W. A. LAMBETH,
F. W. MARVEL,
A. A. STAGG,

Committee.

By vote of the Association the above report was accepted and adopted.

II. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROPER ADMINISTRATION OF COLLEGE ATHLETICS.

This report does not deal with the regular work of the physical department of a college, but concerns itself only with the various forms of competitive athletics which add zest and pleasure to physical training. The best justification of athletics is to be found when it stimulates the whole student body to participate habitually in sane and healthy exercise; the least, when it concentrates interest, money, appliances, opportunities and instruction upon a few already physically fit, while the great mass of students are left without care and attention. It is the easy and

frequent abuse of athletics that makes its problems and forces its proper control upon every wisely organized college.

The report does not discuss, but states briefly the form of organization which seems from experience to be wise and effective while it outlines details and responsibilities.

Control of athletics in a college divides itself into two classes of functions. The first class includes promoting, organizing, practicing, selecting, electing, financing, devising methods, formulating plans, awarding honors and fostering a general institutional interest in the cultivation of a manly athletic spirit. The second class includes idealizing, advising, supervising, confirming, revising, rejecting, admonishing, correcting, disciplining.

The first class of functions belongs to the students' athletic board, made up of athletic association officers, representatives of natural college divisions, captains, managers, coaches, and one or two faculty advisers selected by the students themselves. The second class of functions belongs to the faculty athletic committee. The presiding educational officer is of course a member of this committee *ex officio*, and he appoints say three, five, or seven other members who represent in opinion and policy the dominant opinion and policy of the institution. This committee should be from among the strongest men in the faculty, for its duties require the greatest available wisdom and experience. Upon it there is no place for student, alumnus or business officer; its problems require for their solution the critical ability, wide experience, and impartial judgment of the best type of college professor. It must promote among its students honesty, chivalry, genial good fellowship, and the fine manners of the ideal gentleman. It must strive for absolute fairness in competition. If it does its full duty, it must certainly eliminate many bad things and practices, such as coaches afflicted with professional notions, recruiting, inducing, falsifying, overtraining, over-indulgence in athletics, excessive specialization, hippodroming (that is, students as a traveling show seeking the favor and the shillings of the public), immorality, indecency, profanity among students, and athletics as a business either for commercial or advertising purposes.

This committee must also pass upon the eligibility of candidates for teams, must watch the scholarship of team members during any athletic season, must pass upon schedules of games, upon the elections of the athletic association such as coaches, captains, managers and treasurer. It must rigorously supervise athletic finances and have an effective veto upon all acts of the student athletic board. It must investigate offenses and be the agent of the faculty in their punishment.

At home it must be exact and conscientious in applying rules and regulations, abroad it should be generous and charitable. It

should endeavor to cut out news of college athletics from the prize fighting columns of the metropolitan daily, should oppose newspaper notoriety for immature students and should seek in physical education, as in all other forms, that academic quiet so useful in developing sound, sturdy character.

As has been earlier suggested, the committee should be in cordial sympathy with the dominant sentiment of its college. If that sentiment favors or tolerates professional or semi-professional athletes, so should the committee. If it says amateur inter-collegiate athletics or none, so should the committee.

Here then, in conclusion, we suggest that there might be a realignment of American colleges according to their ideals. Those that believe professional athletes may rightly have a place on a college team, and those that, becoming weary of lying students, see no remedy except to cease asking questions—let them seek each other in friendly rivalry.

On the other hand those colleges that will have amateur athletics or none—let them seek their kind. Thus we will have two great national organizations and between two members of different groups let there be scheduled no athletic contests of any kind. Let the one group admit to its teams, if it wishes, principally those who outside of college and school grounds have had training and experience and become known as experts in baseball, football, basket ball, wrestling, etc. Let it throw its teams wide open to professionals, with only residence and scholarship restrictions, or agonize with the problem of finding a point between semi-professionalism and wide-open professionalism, where students when sorely tempted by self-interest will not falsify. Let it welcome the well-developed poor boy, who, to get money to pay for his education, finds it needful to place his skill on exhibition for wages with summer baseball teams and let it thus establish conditions which finally and necessarily restrict membership on its teams to men of like experience, making college athletics for the amusement rather than the physical training of the many. Let the amateur group agonize with the problem of the deceitful collegian; let it say to the man who falsifies his record that he will surely suffer the same penalty as the man who cheats in examination or is guilty of other dishonesty, namely that he will be dishonorably dismissed from his institution. One theory or the other would soon control all the colleges of the land and we would have peace.

C. A. WALDO,
W. A. LAMBETH,
G. A. HOADLEY,

Committee.

By vote of the Association the above report was referred to the executive committee.

III. REPORT OF THE FOOTBALL RULES COMMITTEE.

It is hardly necessary to remind you of the great agitation against the game of football which followed the close of the season of 1905. With some just grounds for complaint against objectionable features which then existed, the press of the country, ever ready for sensation, started a crusade that soon stirred the American public up to an excited pitch of opposition to football, as then played, so that at one time it seemed almost to threaten the very existence of this greatest of our national games as a college sport.

The primary call for a meeting of a considerable number of colleges, to consider the football situation, which call was the first step that eventually led to the formation of this Association, was sent out with the purpose of suppressing the game and abolishing intercollegiate football. When this Association was finally formed, a few weeks after, a wiser and more moderate policy was adopted and, among other acts, a committee on rules appointed and given broad general instructions, with the purpose of reforming the game, eliminating objectionable features, and evolving a more open and interesting style of play.

Your committee was instructed to consolidate with the old rules committee if possible, and, failing in that, to work independently and evolve a reformed set of rules, remodeling the game along the broad general lines which you laid down.

Very happily a consolidation was effected with the old rules committee and the two have worked together ever since that time in perfect harmony and accord, under the generally recognized title of the American Intercollegiate Rules Committee.

The general instructions given to your committee, which have been renewed each year, were to draw the rules with the aim of abolishing unnecessary roughness and unsportsmanlike conduct, to eliminate mass play, and produce a more open game. From the first your committee has labored faithfully with this object in view. During the first year the most radical and sweeping changes were introduced into the rules. Drastic measures were taken to insure the elimination of unnecessary roughness, brutality and all unsportsmanlike conduct, and full power to enforce these rules was placed in the hands of the officials. The *rules* covering these particular points are adequate. To eliminate mass play and ensure an open game the radical cardinal changes introduced were those requiring, *first*, a gain of ten yards in three downs, in place of five yards; *second*, the elimination of hurdling; *third*, forbidding any of the five heavy center men being drawn back of the line of scrimmage in the formation; *fourth*, requiring six men at all times on the line of scrimmage on the offense; *fifth*, permitting a kicked ball to be recovered by the side kicking

it as soon as it struck the ground, inside the field of play; and *sixth*, introducing the forward pass under certain restrictions.

Since the original revision the rules have been slightly modified and altered from year to year as seemed advisable in perfecting the technique of the play along these cardinal lines. From the first there was general agreement among the players and the public that the "new game," as it was called, was more interesting and spectacular than the old one; it was admitted that the brutal and unsportsmanlike features had been done away with, and the changes were accepted with general pleasure and satisfaction.

But now again we have reached a critical situation in football. The style of play and the rules governing the game are in the limelight before the public.

There have been this year a few sad accidents resulting in the death or serious injury of several players on teams very prominent in the eyes of the public. Following this, many of the newspapers, ever ready to pounce on the sensational, have grossly dilated and misrepresented the accident and casualty list, until now again a portion of the general public, and many of the college faculties, have become agitated over the dangers of the game, and are insisting on radical changes in the rules of play.

When a situation arises demanding action, it must be met. Many college faculties, and a considerable part of the interested public, are as firmly convinced that the dangers of football are excessive, and that the rules must be changed if the game is to be preserved, as they were a few months ago convinced that Dr. Cook discovered the North Pole, and those who doubted it were his calumniators and detractors. I am firmly persuaded that a strong stand must be taken at this time, and the rules changed both because of the public stampede, which demands it, and because I honestly believe that by changes in the rules, as they now stand, it will be possible to diminish present danger and surround the players with greater safety. This can be done and must be done. But, gentlemen, I should not be doing my duty if I failed to include a few statements of facts that bear very vitally on the present situation. During and following the season that is just past, the papers reported thirty-two deaths as a result of injuries in football games. These reports, together with the great prominence that was given to the dangerous element in football, resulting from a fatal accident to one of the West Point cadets in the game with Harvard, and almost coincidentally a serious accident at Annapolis which at first was thought would prove fatal, most naturally caused widespread anxiety and alarm, and have resulted in the faculty demand that football must be made safer if it is to survive. A very careful analysis of the thirty-two deaths reported shows a gross misrepresentation of facts. Many cases were included which could in no way be honestly charged up to

football, while but four men on the reputed list could be classed as college players. These accidents were not inevitable. It is possible to safeguard against such fatalities in a large degree. It is however impossible to absolutely safeguard against all accidents, serious and even sometimes fatal, in football. The situation should be honestly and squarely faced and not dodged. There is danger ever present in baseball, cricket, horseback riding, swimming, boating, automobiling, in skating, hockey, lacrosse and even golf. But the fact that *never* in the history of athletics at Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, Chicago or Wisconsin,—I mention these institutions, there are dozens of others, because football has been pushed in each of them to a high degree of development for many years—has a single fatal accident in football occurred beside the one that happened this year at West Point, should have no small weight with men who give this subject careful and thoughtful consideration.

The greater prominence of football, and the exaggerated accounts of injuries, have accentuated the dangers of this sport above others.

I believe myself that the dangers of physical injuries in football are somewhat greater than those in other sports, though not as much greater as is commonly supposed. But I firmly believe that a wise modification of the rules as they now exist, coupled with a strict and impartial enforcement of them by competent officials, and a coöperation from faculties, school boards and parents to ensure a regulation of the personnel of players to those who have been pronounced physically sound after careful medical examination, and of sufficient age and maturity of development to warrant their engaging in a rough sport, will give a game that no college faculty or parent who believes in manly sport should object to, when the participants have been properly trained and instructed in the science of play.

H. L. WILLIAMS, *Chairman.*

IV. REPORT OF THE CENTRAL BOARD ON OFFICIALS.

This committee has labored untiringly to fulfill the obligations of its appointment, the attainment of a clear and efficient enforcement of the rules in letter and spirit. In order to accomplish this, it has first published a carefully revised list of accredited and competent officials in the Central Western and Southern sections, the importance of this being attested by the flood of applications from all over its territory for official listing in its published group. Secondly, in the arrangement of a general meeting for conference upon the interpretation of the official rules, relative to the rigid and efficient enforcement of the same. Such conference was held at the Murray Hill Hotel in September and was attended by above

a hundred officials and coaches, presided over by Mr. Walter Camp and attended by four of the five members on the central board. Attendance upon such meeting has been made practically obligatory on the part of the officials and a subsequent sheet, embodying important suggestions and phases of interpretation, was issued by the board and sent to all important members of its staff officials. Third, in appointing and assigning about 1000 official positions during the past season, throughout the Central section, including the crucial games of the Maine state league and many of the South and Middle West.

Such service has been an onerous one, involving much labor and voluntary unpaid confinement—frequently many hours of the day and night—and involving considerable personal financial loss.

The prerogative of the board seems on the whole to have been constantly augmented. This is judged by the application for listing on the official list, for appointments in far outlying districts, schools and athletic teams, and the successful outcome in a forcible stand made in at least six important crises of the past season—a strength not heretofore existing.

In review, practically the entire schedules of the twenty-five leading colleges were appointed and the major games of the balance in this territory were under the supervision of the Board. The number of officials upon the accredited list was 162, subsidiary officials upon the trial list 63, maximum distance traveled by one official for a game 750 miles.

Fourteen states were under the direct jurisdiction of the central board, representing forty-six colleges, eighteen preparatory schools, several high schools and occasional athletic clubs by courtesy.

The average fees besides traveling expenses paid to officials in the larger colleges and universities for minor games were \$25, mid-season games \$50, championship games \$75 to \$100. In the smaller colleges, minor games \$10 to \$15, major and championship games \$25 to \$50; schools from \$5 to \$25 per official.

The chairman would express his extreme appreciation to his assistant secretary, Mr. C. Linn Seiler who, on small salary from the central board, rendered constant and painstaking assistance. The work of the board, entirely without individual recompense, has been financed without any college contribution or expense.

The chairman, in completing his report, would express his cordial gratification for the constant support of many important football leaders throughout the Eastern section and on the other hand criticise the growing tendency to place all college football legislation and management in the hands of the professional paid coach, who is more often not an alumnus of the institution and whose interest in victory is merely a pecuniary one. The dangerous policy of jockeying for officials has been almost en-

tirely resident in this factor of the present football situation. It is furthermore the belief of your representative that if all colleges would give any incoming central board or committee absolute and unlimited discretion and power in the appointment of officials, thus eliminating favoritism of all kinds and the necessity for such, the dangerous side of football would be far eliminated. This would produce absolute freedom on the part of officials in drastically and rigidly enforcing the protective rules of the game, with no fear of later appointment rejection, and would produce an increased respect for the principles of absolute neutrality and inter-college courtesy, only in part now existing.

JAMES A. BABBITT, *Chairman.*

The Hon. Thomas E. Hodges, visiting delegate from the University of West Virginia, addressed the Association on the subject of press reports of a recent football game between his institution and Washington and Jefferson College. Mr. Hodges criticised one of the officials of the game for permitting a statement to be made in the press on his authority, charging the West Virginia players and spectators with unsportsmanlike actions. Mr. Hodges warmly defended his institution. On motion of Professor Phillips, the whole matter was referred to the central board on officials for action and for such regulations as will prevent the publication of similar statements by officials in the future.

President W. H. Crawford, representing the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of Western Pennsylvania and West Virginia, introduced at this point a resolution of that Association on the subject of the reform of football, and addressed the meeting on the subject of the resolution.

The executive committee were given power to take action in the matter of meeting part of the expenses of the central board of officials if they deem best.

V. SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COLLEGIATE BASKET BALL RULES COMMITTEE.

The Basket Ball Rules Committee has a very encouraging report to present. During the past year a general improvement in the game has been noticeable and the rules committee is well established, covering practically the entire country. There has been a noticeable increase in the number of colleges playing basket ball, and while some few institutions dropped the sport mainly on account of local conditions, the rules committee is of the opinion that the condition of the game of basket ball is better to-day than ever before in the college world.

There is still some criticism on the score of roughness, and this feature will be eliminated by your committee by further legislation and by education. The rules committee is of the opinion that much of the criticism of basket ball is due to the ignorance of those playing the game in many sections; to the ignorance of many officials; and to poor facilities for playing the game (such as restricted space), rather than to basic faults with the game itself.

With this end in view the rules committee has planned a campaign of education for players and officials alike. First, we will treat of officials.

The rules committee, through its central board of officials, has caused to be published a directory of officials. Officials who have been placed in this directory are presumably the most competent men from their several parts of the country. By referring to this directory therefore it is possible to secure competent officials. The men listed are constantly in touch with the rules committee and receive from the rules committee from time to time pamphlets, explaining and illustrating points in the rules which naturally arise from time to time.

To keep this directory up to date and to be sure that none but competent men are included, report blanks have been prepared for the captain, manager or coach of the competing teams in each game to fill in and mail to the central board on officials commenting on the work of the officials during the game. The rules committee has emphasized the importance of filing reports, as it is realized that only by such coöperation on the part of every school and college team can the list of officials be kept in first class condition.

To further educate the officials and to educate the players as well, the rules committee has provided for interpretation meetings in four sections of the country just prior to the playing season each year. During the past year these meetings have been held with profit alike to players, officials and rules committee. At these meetings the members of your committee are able to meet first hand a number of those actively interested in the sport. In the East, for instance, the interpretation meeting, which was held in New York City, December 4, 1909, was attended by about fifty persons, representing officials and college players. Chairman R. B. Hyatt took the chair at this meeting and conducted the discussion, explaining the rules in a manner absolutely impossible on the cold pages of a rule book.

A more widely attended meeting of the same character was presided over by Dr. J. E. Raycroft of the University of Chicago at Chicago earlier in the year, while Dr. James Naismith of the rules committee held an interpretation meeting for the colleges and officials of the Southwest. Dr. E. D. Angell, also of the

rules committee, likewise held a meeting of interpretation on the Pacific Coast.

While on the subject of geography, the rules committee desires to state that basket ball has taken a firm hold on the colleges of the South and there are many new teams among the colleges of the Virginias and the Carolinas.

The changes in the rules for the year were for the most part toward simplifying the code. The dribble, holding, the foul for the third man in a scrimmage, out of bounds and other points were cleared up.

The rules committee believes that the game is well in hand and that a pursuit of the present policies for a year or so longer will result in further betterment.

RALPH MORGAN, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

The committee on the "amateur law," through its chairman, Prof. C. W. Hetherington, presented a synopsis of their complete report. The report was referred to the executive committee for further consideration.

AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

The following amendments to the Constitution and By-laws were adopted:

To Article III. of the Constitution this section shall be added:

"Section 3.—Any institution of learning in the United States, not included within the definition of the Constitution as to active membership, may become an associate member of this Association. The delegate of an associate member shall have the same privileges in the Association as the delegate of an active member, except that he shall not be entitled to vote."

To Article II. of the By-Laws this section shall be added:

"Section 2.—Each institution of learning that is an associate member of this Association shall pay \$10 annually to assist in defraying the necessary expenses."

FOOTBALL REFORM.

The Association then took up the discussion of needed reforms in football, and the secretary reported the receipt of communications as follows:

1. A statement of the vote of a number of the colleges on the question of football.
2. Memorial from the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association.
3. Communication from David Huddlestone, Pasadena, Cal.

4. Resolutions from New York University.
5. Resolution of the faculty of Wesleyan University.
6. Resolutions of the faculty of Syracuse University.
7. Communication from the chancellor of the University of Kansas.
8. Communication from the chancellor of the University of Pittsburg.
9. Communication from the president of the New York State Intercollegiate Athletic Union.
10. Communication from the president of the Transylvania University.
11. Communication from the athletic committee of the University of Pittsburg.
12. Communication from the president of Wake Forest College.
13. Communication from the secretary of a conference of the following colleges: Hampden-Sidney, Randolph-Macon, William and Mary, and Richmond.
14. Communication from the faculty of Cornell College.
15. Resolutions adopted by the faculty of Amherst College.
16. Communication from the president of the Peru State Normal School.
17. Communication from the president of the Clemson College Athletic Association.
18. Communication from the president of Ouachita College.
19. Suggestions from a number of Ohio colleges.
20. A letter to the *New York Herald*, signed "J. Smith."
21. An anonymous communication signed "A Football Lover."
22. Newspaper clipping giving the views of President Baer of Occidental College.
23. A newspaper clipping giving resolutions adopted by fourteen leading educational institutions of Virginia.
24. The West Point resolutions with executive committee amendments.

A number of the above communications were read to the Association.

President Edwin A. Alderman of the University of Virginia made an eloquent address, telling of the sad experience of his institution this year in the death of one of their promising students, and stating that in his judgment football as an American college sport was doomed unless radical changes were made.

Prof. C. A. Short of Delaware College spoke of the danger of legislative intervention and of the possibility that the playing of football might, in some states, be treated as a crime.

Prof. E. K. Hall of Dartmouth introduced the following resolution: "That the Football Rules Committee of this Association be instructed to use every possible endeavor to bring about such a

modification of the rules as shall, in their judgment, tend to reduce to a minimum the dangers of physical injury to the players, and at the same time retain, so far as may be feasible, the most desirable and wholesome features of the game."

Prof. H. A. Peck of Syracuse University gave it as his opinion that the time had come for the Association to make its football rules independent of the original rules committee.

Mr. W. F. Garcelon explained the attitude of Harvard University in joining the Association, and stated that if the action proposed by the last speaker were taken, the representative of Harvard would be compelled to notify the secretary that his institution would not be bound by the action of the Association.

Dr. H. L. Williams expressed the hope that the Association would continue to instruct its committee to amalgamate with the original committee.

Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., and Prof. R. G. Clapp introduced amendments to the motion providing that the rules, when drawn up by the rules committee, should be submitted to the executive committee of the Association for consideration before being promulgated.

Professor Clapp's amendment was seconded, in which it was proposed to substitute the words, "as shall in the judgment of the executive committee," for the words, "in their judgment." The amendment was put and lost. Dr. James A. Babbitt urged the Association to leave power in the hands of the rules committee, who could not have failed from the foregoing discussion to appreciate the sentiment of the colleges in the matter of football reform.

Mr. Hall's motion was then carried, the institutions voting as follows: In favor of the resolution, Amherst College, Bates College, College of the City of New York, Columbia University, Dartmouth College, Delaware College, Harvard University, Haverford College, Indiana University, Iowa State College, Lehigh University, New York University, North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Northwestern University, Norwich University, Oberlin College, Ohio State University, Ohio Wesleyan University, Pennsylvania State College, Stevens Institute of Technology, Syracuse University, Tufts College, University of Arkansas, University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, University of Nebraska, University of North Carolina, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburg, University of Tennessee, University of Virginia, Vanderbilt University, Washington and Jefferson College, West Virginia University and Williams College. Opposed to the resolution, Allegheny College. U. S. Military Academy, University of Kansas, Wesleyan University. Not voting, Rutgers College.

On motion it was resolved that all communications received by the secretary from individuals, institutions and associations on the subject of reform in football should be handed over to the rules committee appointed by this Association for their careful consideration, study and guidance.

It was voted that the rules committee, to be appointed later, should meet at 8 o'clock in the evening and that all delegates who cared to do so should be invited to meet them and present their ideas concerning the reformation of the game.

It was voted to request the representatives in the several districts to include in their reports to the Association hereafter a statement concerning the deaths or serious injuries resulting from football during the season in their respective districts, with all the details concerning the nature and cause of the injury which they can gather.

Dr. R. Tait McKenzie reported to the Association the results of an investigation made by himself and others into the reported deaths from football during the season just passed, showing that of the thirty-two reported deaths, eighteen were not due to football; concerning the remaining fourteen, no information was obtained in five cases. Of the remaining nine, three were schoolboys from eleven to fifteen years of age, one was a member of an athletic club, and five were college students.

RULES COMMITTEES.

The executive committee nominated the following to serve as the Intercollegiate Basket Ball Rules Committee for the year 1910, and they were duly elected: Mr. R. B. Hyatt, Yale; Mr. Ralph Morgan, University of Pennsylvania; Mr. Harry A. Fisher, Columbia; Lieut. Joseph W. Stilwell, U. S. Military Academy; Dr. J. E. Raycroft, University of Chicago; Dr. James Naismith, University of Kansas; Mr. Oswald Tower, Williams.

On the nomination of the executive committee, the following representative Football Rules Committee was elected: Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota; Dr. James A. Babbitt, Haverford; Mr. E. K. Hall, Dartmouth; Lieut. H. B. Hackett, U. S. Military Academy; Prof. W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt; Dr. W. A. Lambeth, University of Virginia; Prof. C. W. Savage, Oberlin.

The following resolutions were adopted for a guidance to the football rules committee:

That the committee for 1910 be composed of seven members and be directed to act as follows:

1. To communicate with the representatives of Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Annapolis and Chicago Uni-

versity, which constituted the committee that formed the football rules committee during 1905, and propose that the committee be amalgamated into one which shall formulate rules under which football shall be played during 1910.

2. If this amalgamation be not accomplished, then the above named committee of seven shall proceed to formulate rules under which football shall be played by the institutions enrolled in this Association.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The committee on nominations reported as follows:

FOR PRESIDENT.

Captain Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. A.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT.

Prof. R. Tait McKenzie, University of Pennsylvania.

FOR SECRETARY-TREASURER.

Prof. F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.

FOR DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES.

First District, Prof. F. W. Marvel, Brown University.
 Second District, Director W. N. Golden, Pennsylvania State College.
 Third District, Prof. A. H. Patterson, University of North Carolina.
 Fourth District, Prof. C. W. Savage, Oberlin College.
 Fifth District, Prof. S. W. Beyer, Iowa State College.
 Sixth District, Prof. C. W. Hetherington, University of Missouri.

It was unanimously voted that the secretary cast a ballot for the above nominees, and, the ballot being cast, they were duly declared elected.

The Association thereupon adjourned to meet at the call of the executive committee.

FRANK W. NICOLSON, *Secretary.*

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION.

I: THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

CAPT. PALMER E. PIERCE, PRESIDENT.

Some five years ago the outcry against certain features of intercollegiate athletics became so loud that the colleges had to listen. As a result, a meeting was called by Chancellor MacCracken of New York University, of those interested in the reforms that seemed necessary.

It was my good fortune to be deputized by the superintendent of the Military Academy to represent West Point at this gathering. The authorities at the national school were puzzled as to what action should be taken during the coming conference. As you all may know, West Point's personal interest in the matters at issue was small. Her athletic condition was satisfactory. No problems were crying for solution in her institutional or intercollegiate athletics. This is a military school where iron discipline prevails. The superintendent is in virtual control of athletics, as well as of other administrative features of the institution. The questions of summer baseball, of amateurism, of proselyting, of keeping men more than four years in school on account of their athletic ability, of paying men in some way or other for their services on athletic fields, did not affect the Military Academy. The manner of the appointment of cadets, and control of them while in school, the purpose for which the institution is run, all prevented such questions from arising.

If the superintendent issues an order that to play on a team cadets must have good standing, both as to academic work and as to conduct, there is never any question nor difficulty in enforcing this. It is an order of the competent authority, and is carried out as a matter of course.

Many of you can appreciate from your own difficulties how simple and efficient such control must be.

Again, West Point had had no serious accidents on her athletic fields, and the heavy mass plays of football of that time appealed to the military instincts of the fighting man.

Therefore, when the superintendent directed that West Point should be represented at the approaching conference, it was some time before we could decide what part we should play. At last it was agreed that I should carry with me two propositions, and use the one that seemed to meet the conditions that might develop.

The first of these propositions was to be presented in case the meeting was poorly attended, and read about as follows: "Since the meagre attendance of delegates indicates the lack of interest by the universities and colleges of the United States in the athletic matters proposed for their consideration to-day, therefore, be it resolved to adjourn without further action *sine die*."

The other, in effect, was as follows:

"A. To reform football, not destroy it.

"B. To provide some permanent organization for the betterment of intercollegiate athletics, and for the proper control and support of representative rules committees."

Upon entering this room on the day of the first meeting, a glance was sufficient to indicate to me which resolution should govern the representative of West Point. There were seated here the delegates of some seventy colleges and universities. Some of the institutions represented were large and many small; some were situated in the East and others in the West of this great land of ours. I think I am safe in asserting that so large a gathering of the representatives of universities and colleges had never before taken place.

It is not necessary to go into the actions of that first conference and the details of the formation of its rules committee, except to say that the fundamental idea carried out was, to secure a representative committee that should enact rules suitable for the needs of all and not the few. There was no attempt to supersede the old football rules committee, but a successful effort was made to work in harmony with them.

After the conference of 1905, a duly elected committee took the first steps for the formation of a permanent organization. A constitution and by-laws were prepared, founded on the idea that the Association should be a militant one, to govern with a strong hand the intercollegiate athletics throughout the United States. Further consideration, however, convinced the committee that an organization along that line was not only not wise, but, in addition, was impracticable. It was felt that the country was too large, the colleges too numerous, the interests too diverse to make a strong governing organization possible. In addition, the organization was not yet strong enough to be really national in character and influence.

Therefore, the present constitution and by-laws were drafted and adopted. The basic idea is expressed in Article VIII. therein, viz.: "The colleges and universities enrolled in this Association severally agree to take control of student athletic sports, so far as may be necessary to maintain in them a high standard of personal honor, eligibility and fair play, and to remedy whatever abuses may exist." The statement that any particular person, or set of persons, should assume such control, was carefully avoided,

as also that any change of existing methods was needed. Whether the control was of the faculty, board of trustees, graduate committees, student bodies, or any combination of these, was held immaterial.

The resulting organization has little governing force except by its influence, which is, and always has been, most powerful—more so than most of you realize.

In this room to-day are representatives from all parts of the land. Our institutions vary greatly in size, in surroundings and in ideals. We meet here together to listen to the prepared addresses and the reports from the representatives of the various districts into which the country is divided, to take part in the discussions and thus have our views of the athletic conditions, and the best methods of dealing with the many vexatious problems, made much clearer by the wide experiences of others. There has grown up during the past five years, in consequence, a uniformity in the ideals of collegiate athletics, and of methods of securing them, that is very encouraging.

It was soon seen, however, that there was a lack of organization of colleges in many parts of the country. The advisability of having local organizations was early felt. Every encouragement, therefore, was given to the formation of local leagues among the colleges and universities for mutual benefit. As a result, a number of such have been formed, and I wish to urge upon the representatives of the colleges present here to-day, the advisability of local combination to secure the ideals for which we are all striving. Organized effort in all forms of activity is now recognized as essential to success. It is as much so here as in other things.

This Association carries on its propaganda for saner, purer collegiate sports by an educational campaign, in which I urge every one of you to take active part.

The treasurer's report shows that the greater part of the expenditures of the past year were for printing and the sending of literature through the mails. The excellent addresses delivered at the conferences are published in some suitable magazine, and copies are distributed to all colleges and universities of the country. In addition special reports are sent out, from time to time, and articles placed in the newspapers—all with the endeavor to educate the masses and the students to higher athletic ideals.

WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION DURING 1909.

Two meetings of the executive committee were held during the year—one of these was in January, immediately following the last annual conference, the other December 27. The rest of the business of the Association was carried on altogether by correspondence.

100
309
H 300
X

The membership of the Association has grown during the present year, and we are pleased to welcome to our ranks, as new members, the following universities and colleges: College of the City of New York, Bates, Harvard, Columbia, University of Indiana, Brown University, Delaware College, University of Tennessee, Norwich University, University of Arkansas, Carleton College, University of Mississippi.

[

- The number of colleges belonging in 1906 was 39.
- The number of colleges belonging in 1907 was 49.
- The number of colleges belonging in 1908 was 57.
- The number of colleges belonging in 1909 is 67.

Q

It will be seen, from this, that the need of this organization is now being widely recognized, and its methods and aims are meeting with approval. It is believed that in time all the institutions of the country, of any athletic importance whatever, will become members and take their proper share of the burden of controlling collegiate athletics.

I think it is now well known that the purposes of this organization are good, and the efforts of those carrying on its work are disinterested. The public in general is becoming convinced that the field that we have entered upon is an important one for the good of the nation.

It is said that of the successful men of affairs in our land fifty per cent are college graduates. If these graduates get false ideals of life on the college athletic field, it must be admitted that they are apt to carry these same ideals into the practical affairs of after life. Hence, it seems very important that the boys of the land should be taught, if they have not the idea already, that to *lose fairly* is better than to *win unfairly*.

Q

The object of this Association is to improve amateur athletics among our colleges and universities. "Sport for Sport's Sake" is the motto that we have held up since the beginning of this organization.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN ASSOCIATION.

It was a question at first whether there was any necessity for such an Association as this one. It has been shown, however, conclusively, by the events of the past year, that there is. By means of this Association representative rules committees are possible. The recent crisis in football plainly indicates that such committees, governed by some responsible body such as ours, are necessary. I myself do not see how the present situation could be satisfactorily met otherwise.

Whether or not the problem will be properly solved to-day, remains to be seen. Certainly it can be said that the colleges and

universities, throughout the land, now have a medium through which their wishes and wants can be made known to the rules committee.

This Association does not belong to the society of muck-rakers. It distinctly discourages the bringing of dissension into the public print. It does, however, undertake and encourage investigation into collegiate athletics for the purpose of finding a remedy for the evils that exist. For instance, it undertook an inquiry into the summer baseball question and found the situation a lamentable one. It is now seeking a solution to this vexed problem. As one step in this direction a committee has been working on the subject of amateurism during the past year. The ideas on this subject are remarkably hazy, and I believe it is pretty generally admitted that we can make little real progress until public student opinion is properly formed on the amateur subject. Every delegate present should aid in this work by personal effort during the coming year. See that appropriate articles are printed in the college papers, and when a chance comes say a word to the students on fair play, and the unfairness that comes of a fellow's playing for money part of the year, coming back to college, concealing this fact and playing in competitive games against other fellows who have not done so.

The crisis in football this year has overshadowed every other issue. Nevertheless in my opinion the baseball situation in our colleges is more serious than the football. The moral degeneration that comes from the playing of summer baseball for money, and then returning to college and deceiving the college authorities about this in order to play in intercollegiate contests, is deplorable. And yet I suppose each one of us knows that such practice is all too common.

Some of our colleges honestly endeavor to make the amateur law apply strictly to baseball as to the other sports; some pretend to do this; while a few come out squarely, and say their students can play during the summer time and not lose their eligibility status. I suppose all three of these classes are represented here to-day. How are we to reconcile methods so widely different? It seems to me it is first necessary to understand what is an amateur and the necessity for the law of amateurs. I therefore recommend a careful study of the report on this subject presented by our committee to-day, and a continuation of the agitation for a satisfactory solution of this vexed question.

Another subject to be reported on to-day is the proper control of collegiate athletics. This is a matter that is not thoroughly understood in many institutions. In fact much of the evil in collegiate athletics to-day is due to this lack of sane and persistent control by some authorized person or persons. *sane*

A distinct effort has been made to form minor leagues of col-

leges whose interests are similar. Many of these are in existence, but I hope to see more formed in New York, in Eastern Pennsylvania, in the Southern Atlantic States and wherever else such organizations are lacking.

I wish to urge upon all members of this Association the desirability of adopting the three-year rule and of limiting the number of freshmen contests. Be careful that too great development in the intercollegiate contests of the first-year men does not defeat the purpose of this excellent rule.

Finally, let me emphasize again the necessity of keeping in mind the fact that this is a home-rule organization, based on a belief in the honesty of purpose of one another. The number of students enrolled in the various institutions represented by our members is about 100,000. What a power for good this Association will be when its ideals of fair play and gentlemanly conduct are carried out thoroughly by all of them!

II. THE FUNCTION OF COLLEGE ATHLETICS.

CHANCELLOR JAMES ROSCOE DAY, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY.

Your secretary has relieved me of some responsibility, as well as no little perplexity, in assigning the subject of this paper.

I have been a sympathetic observer of college athletics for sixteen years, although never an athlete. My only experience was with baseball at the preparatory school, the sum of which was one hit by the ball and one hit by the bat. The ball landed under my eye and left its mark for some days. But it always has been a satisfaction to me that they never found that ball after it was hit by the bat at its next attempt at my eye.

When I went to Syracuse University we had no football field nor track for field sports. We had not so much as bleachers upon which to accommodate spectators. Almost my first work was to secure an athletic field and grandstand. Mr. John D. Archbold, the president of the board of trustees asked me what I wanted the field for. I replied, "So that the students may work off their surplus energy on themselves and not on me."

My first observations as a college president showed me that there was a surplus energy in the young men. And it seemed to me that it could not be suppressed, and if it could be, it would be most harmful to suppress it. It should be directed and allowed full swing. Indeed, it should be developed and cultivated, for it was something that could be worked up into scholarship and manhood.

Our great gymnasium and magnificent stadium at Syracuse are

simply a declaration of our confirmed judgment that athletics have an essential and fundamental place in college work, and that they are vitally related to scholarship and manhood. The man who gave us our first field and grandstand is the man who gave us our gymnasium and stadium. He belongs to a class of men in this country well known for the keen discernment and sound wisdom with which they estimate values by practical results.

Athletics have a place in college life and training. They belong to sound learning. They are not an excrescence but the fibre and essential integrity of the best educational system and plan.

The college deals with the whole man and must have the whole man. It must work over his blood corpuscles that the best kind of physical condition may enter the class room and laboratory. Men think with their blood and they must have the best blood possible. Whatever enters into the wholesome structure of the blood is essential to scholarship. The bone, the muscle, the nerve, the circulation, the respiration, the secretory functions, all are intimately related to study and sound thinking. They are agents which the mind uses. Whatever promotes them renders invaluable service to the mind.

Therefore Greek is debtor, Latin is debtor, mathematics, the empirical sciences, the modern languages, philosophy, the professions,—all are debtors to athletics. The best scholastic results have always had to take account of physical exercise in some form. If in these days the colleges are supplied with generous facilities for physical development, it is due to the spirit of an age that is gathering up essential things and concentrating them into the most economical expressions of energy and utility and making them practical at all times to the largest number.

But if athletics have a place in college, what place have they? If what I have said is true, their place is with the students and not with the treasurer. Their office is to serve the students and not to advertise the college. They are for the college only as the students are for the college.

It is a notorious fact that athletics have been used by many institutions for purposes of advertising pure and simple. You gentlemen have found it difficult to resist this mercenary purpose upon the part of some of the institutions. They have sent out their agents into preparatory schools. They have enlisted their alumni for so-called scholarship aid. They have bribed star athletes away from other colleges. They have played ringers. It is an old story. The iniquity has been measurably corrected. It is not a regeneration, however; it is a suppression. It has to be watched continually. There are institutions that will not play or row with some other colleges whom they fear, because if beaten it would hurt their prestige and decrease the advertising value of their teams or crews.

The serious part of this is that it reduces athletics to a few star performers, secured by special inducements and by excessive professional training, who can most successfully act the part of college advertisers. Everything is sorted, culled and selected for the eleven men who can beat in the game. The only encouragement is to him who can beat. The only incentive is the goal posts. Two hundred or four hundred men are sacrificed for the great autumn advertisement. And upon the result announcements go out of great colleges and minor colleges, of big colleges and little colleges. For two months the colleges are billed like circuses and their players are discussed as star performers.

If one resists such a revolting aspect of college life and urges brains instead of massed muscle, he is held up as a patron of mollycoddles and told that such things belong to women's colleges.

It is difficult to say how the spirit of beating can be sanely directed so as to secure the stimulating effect of competitive skill and not permit the accident or skill of a goal to be the measure of college merit. At present winning seems to be the only measure of a contest. It is that for which we look from the kick-off of a football game. Every play is measured by its distance from the goal posts. The explanation is in human nature and you would have to pull up the constitution of man to eradicate it. How far colleges can afford to go into such arena entertainments and make a spectacle of themselves is a question that has perplexed many college presidents who are neither fossils nor mollycoddles.

Certain it is that whatever appropriates college athletics to the show business and degenerates them into a mere college advertising medium should be resisted as undignified and as defeating the large and wholesome purpose of serving the entire student body.

Of a piece with the advertising is the money consideration. This is too obvious for discussion. Gambling and betting are of the same quality of degeneracy. Gate receipts have been the price at which honor has been sold.

Some strong men have sought to correct these two tendencies by urging the elimination of intercollegiate games with their admission fees and sporting features. It may come to this. It will not come until we all appreciate the fact that athletics are for the students first, last and all the time.

How far do intercollegiate contests serve the whole student body of a college?

That they promote college spirit and loyalty no one can doubt. That they have pulled obscure colleges out of back towns and given them a reputation to which they had not attained in other ways is true. But whether the college spirit could not have been given a more wholesome development and whether the reputation

for physical training and athletic prowess is the best for colleges whose work is the development of character, intellect and high morals, is a serious question.

Which is the greater value to the students? How far should the students be sacrificed to the entertainment of the public? To answer these questions, you must study them from the inside.

What is the effect of hiring a coach at a greater salary for the time served than the president of the college receives, as is true of nearly all of our larger colleges and universities, and the use of methods that look only to the development of eleven stars of first magnitude and eleven more of second magnitude for exhibition purposes? How often have we seen the one or two hundred men fade away from the football field as soon as the places on the team have been allotted.

How far does an expensive training table, to which twenty-five or thirty men are taken, help to promote a general interest among the hundreds whose inefficiency is announced in every meal that is served to those whose skill has secured this "stall feed"? Is it the function of college athletics to develop the few or the many? And is it not true that intercollegiate sports are largely defeating the general purpose of athletics in the colleges and promoting foolish rivalries, gambling and a classification of college merits upon altogether wrong principles?

If athletics are for the students they should be so diversified that an adaptation may be made to all classes of students. In a body of students, large or small, a natural classification will be dictated by taste, by muscular strength, by nervous energy and by apt skill. All cannot play football. Some would spurn lawn tennis. All cannot row. Some are not agile enough for basketball. Some cannot participate in field sports. No sport should absorb the attention and the money of the institution. All should have right of way. All of the forms of athletics except one should not be compelled to sit down with folded arms until that one has played out its season, especially when that one recruits for only nine or eleven men. It should be the work of the athletic department to schedule the whole student body so far as requirements apply, not simply for the monotonous drill of the gymnasium but for all of the sports known to college athletics.

The whole body of students should be enlisted, classes against classes, chapters against chapters, students against alumni where the latter can be used. And the number and variety of the sports should be limited only to the aptitude and taste of students.

A gentleman came into my office a few years ago and inquired how many crews we had on the lake. I told him three, possibly four. He said: "I am a graduate of Cambridge, England. How many do you think we have there? We have one hundred and five." And he said that this characterized their

athletics in other departments. That seemed like a great strain on the little river Cam. That was the enthusiasm of aquatic sports where they have not room to row but have to "bump" each other out of the contests.

I hope to see the day when every student will enthusiastically engage in athletic exercises and make a sport of them. Nothing short of this can justify the large expenditures or the place and time given to them. If they do not make better students, they cannot be justified. They are taking money and time that should be devoted to other things. If we have them, it must be for adjunctive scholastic purposes. They must be made to bear upon the serious business of life's preparatory work. They must mix life into inertia, a quickening force into difficult problems and the prosaic tasks of the class room and laboratory.

If athletics are for the students, they must be not only numerously diversified, but of both a harmless and wholesome character.

The lives of the students must not be sacrificed to a sport. Athletic sports must be selected with strict regard to the safety of those practicing them. It must be remembered that the sport is not the end. It is incidental to another end far more important. We lose sight of both the purpose and the proportion when we sacrifice the student to the sport. Any game that kills in different parts of the country college men every season and every year maims a number equal to the attendance of the average American college, should be changed so as to eliminate its fatal features or be excluded from our colleges entirely.

There is nothing in healthy physical development or the cultivation of the manly instincts in competitive sports that requires the sacrifice of a single life. All of the results sought in athletics can be secured within bounds of safety to bone and life. The responsibility of offering up lives upon the altar of sport is so great that no college administration can carry it and answer to its constituency. If those who are entrusted with our college games cannot or will not remove those features that have been so fatal to even the best trained athletes, then the college authorities will be compelled to exclude the game from the colleges, for one of the prime functions of college athletics is the development of physical and mental powers and not their destruction.

The game of football has been a fine game and has been justified by many of its qualities. With the public, it is the most popular of any of the college games, but the killing of one man a season would be a toll which it could not justify by all that it ever has done for the colleges. I speak as a friend of football when I say that the colleges can afford to be without football but they cannot afford to have their men killed and maimed

in a game that at best serves only a small number, an exceedingly small proportion of college men. It is a game as now played which admits of very few contestants, and those the men who need it least—men of the most robust, vigorous physical powers.

It must be made more of a game and less of a mere pounding, pushing and smashing contest. It must be played more with brains and less with weight and muscular energy.

It is impossible to hurl eleven men at eleven other men in a rush at top speed and with all the energy they can command without the always imminent peril of death or broken bones. The very safeguards against such an impact, of padded bodies, head-gears, ankle protectors and nose guards, plainly declare the danger of such a performance. Eleven men rush with their utmost power at the goal posts from and beyond a line midway of a large field. Eleven other men rush wildly at them, excited, determined upon stopping them at all hazards. The result is told in every college football field in the country. Not one of them escapes the serious maiming of an embarrassing per cent of their players. Some colleges are so crippled as to be put out of the game for the season. Some colleges have escaped fatalities, but only by good fortune, for some of the deaths this year have occurred in the best trained student bodies of the country. Even our Army and Navy schools have not escaped death or terrible accident.

Can the attitude of the colleges toward this great game in the present form be a question any longer?

If it were a game for athletes who earn a living by it, then they might be expected to invest their lives and limbs if they thought the receipts justified it, as men do in the wage or profit pursuits of life that are attended by risk of death or accident, like iron setters, coal miners and seamen.

Is the fact that the game is the great money winner for the colleges the reason that fatalities are excused and palliated and the college authorities, urged by the athletic departments, are hesitant about declaring themselves against a game that reaps such harvests of death among students?

We must keep tenaciously in view all the time the fact that all games are for the students and no game should be tolerated a minute, whatever its gate receipts, that menaces the lives of the students. There is no profit of gain or any return whatever that warrants students in investing their lives in the game or running the chance, for what they can get out of it or do with it, of limping through life on disjointed bones and torn ligaments.

We must remember that we must account for our best men physically. This machine is a Moloch among the finest specimens of the college community—men whose superb physiques are an invaluable endowment for their life work. The college

must not be a party to their destruction. There can be no defense for a form of sport that imperils the lives of the best developed and most highly trained athletes of our colleges when the returns are limited to the few of this class and could be secured in other athletic forms without such a terrible price.

I believe that I express the sober but intense thought of the country when I say that it is my conviction that if your honorable body does not make over football so that the colleges may have the game without its death-dealing features, without those plays that maim and cripple the players, it will be the duty of the colleges to exclude the game from the list of college sports.

If we cannot have football without crippling men for life, if we cannot have it without a surgeon on the field to set broken bones, we cannot afford to have it. It will have to be excluded as a peril that threatens our students for which the great common community will hold us accountable.

I would regret to see football excluded, but I would rather never have another game at the university for whose administration I am responsible than that it cause the death of one man in a half century. Men are too valuable for us to pay for them in football. Football is too expensive at that price.

That the fatal features can be eliminated and leave us football—if not what we have, something that will answer the purpose for the students and for the public as a secondary purpose—I have no doubt.

Killing men by football is a comparatively recent invention. It was played in this country for many years without fatalities. The first man killed shocked us, but it was said that he was not trained or was organically weak. Three or four men killed and then a dozen and now fifteen in the colleges and secondary schools in a year is the march of death which has become more deadly by improved rules. And it should be said that some of the rules which have been most deadly have been made by colleges outside of this Association.

It must be possible to create a game without fatalities. If not, then let us adopt Rugby or Association. The California colleges and universities have adopted Rugby with safety to their students and great satisfaction to the public.

We should undertake a radical reform before parents and guardians and an alarmed citizenship appeal to the legislatures for protection. It would be a sorry comment upon the colleges if they found themselves incompetent to grasp the situation of safe athletics for their students, and an infinitely worse accusation if it could be made to appear that they are willing to sacrifice one life among them for gate receipts or competitive advertising.

Every form of athletics should be examined critically with

reference to its bearing upon the main purpose of student development.

In general athletics, the distance of rowing and running, the question of training, the contests of the track, the trips away from college work, the dissipation and sporting features,—these all should come under most critical examination by the colleges as having to do with college scholarship.

The adjustment of athletics to the college to secure their largest and most direct function requires a twofold use of them—the one of earnest service, the other of exhilarating recreation. They must be used with careful attention to the sound body as a condition to the sound mind and therefore they should be required. With an elective privilege of athletics in the upper classes, they should continue through the whole college course. The student should be studied and athletic training should be applied with intelligent regard to the especially needed physical demands. But the task should be beguiled by sport and relieved by competitive games, all to be estimated and valued by what is seen in practical results, and these results to be tested by healthy scholarship. Do athletics not only relieve the drudgery of work but do they furnish energy and enthusiasm for the classroom and the laboratory? This is the test.

And this leads me to consider a criticism often repeated, flippant and groundless, that after athletics there seems little time in the college for study—"Now that the football season is over there will be time for books for a little while," and "What scholars there would be in the college if it only meant football," or again, "If the enthusiasm of athletics could only be turned into the lecture room."

The charge that athletics are out of proportion to study in the colleges is made without knowledge of the facts and inconsiderately.

There are different expressions of enthusiasm. In athletic games it is noisy and tumultuous. There are bands of music and waving banners and wild cheers and yells.

In scholarship there are none of these. But there is a quiet sacrifice of comfort and hard work and self-denial in vacation to earn the way at college. The enthusiasm is seen in shoveling paths and tending furnaces in winter and caring for lawns and doing odd jobs, selling books and working the farm in summer. It amounts to an enthusiasm, for men by thousands in our colleges are working their way, and though crowded out by poverty they return again and toil on until they make the scholastic goal posts.

The test is in the fact that standards of scholarship were never higher and no concessions are made to athletes in scholarship

ranking. The last hour of graduation requirement is exacted to the last minute.

When athletics used intelligently are systematically adjusted, the study habit is promoted and the best results to scholarship are secured.

College athletics have a moral function. They absorb attention from diversions that are not wholesome and engage physical force and restless energy in ways that supplant the vitiating practices that employ the idle and indolent.

The time is spent in the well-equipped gymnasium under intelligent instruction in the many forms of physical exercise and development, in the sport of swimming, in rowing at the machines, at the punching bags, at basket ball, at the shot put, in the bowling alleys, in the ball cages, on the running track, in the general exercises of the practice floors,—an extent and variety of athletics in the college which the public does not know or appreciate.

And these exercises combine in a most healthful moral force. They prevent much that would be depraving, in place, time and practice.

The student seeks his gymnasium and athletic field instead of loafing places in the town. He learns the relation of his body to his mind and its use as an instrument of power, and learns to prize it and take care of it and comes to feel that he has a sacred responsibility for its condition and best use.

He is under the common knowledge and inspection of his fellow students and is held in wholesome restraint with regard to his bodily condition, and this constitutes a deterrent against immoral disease, while the healthy exercises impart a virility and ambition, a quickened current of life and force, that seek expression in a more active mentality.

Athletics stimulate ideals. The positive moral qualities are brought into play. A fine athlete has a sense of honor; he is made to appreciate the claims of his fellow contestant. He must play the game fairly. Self-restraint and control, patience and fortitude,—in a word, manhood,—are indirectly but forcibly inculcated in the practices of college athletics. If I had a mean, selfish sneak of a man who was a hard proposition for even religion, I would put him into training, as a supplementary aid, among a lot of college boys in the gymnasium and make him play the college games for four years.

May I then sum it all up in a sentence. The function of college athletics is to secure to the whole student body the most healthful physical development in the most exhilarating manner for the purposes of a sound and healthy scholarship by adapting and using all manner of exercises and sports; and for the pur-

pose also of inculcating practical moral ideals and the moral uses of the body in the development of manhood.

And may I urge trustees and patrons of our colleges to give their wisest consideration to athletics as a department of college instruction and not simply to tolerate it, misled by flippant and ill-considered criticisms.

May I urge upon the public press that it assign to the study of college athletics their best-informed men, sympathetic with the best things in college life, and not men who are partisans of given colleges or subject to feelings of rivalries and prejudices. It is a large subject and should be discussed by strong, impartial and competent men of the press. The recent graduate is incompetent.

There is more to it than appears in competitive games. It appears in every form of college life, in every recitation, in every examination, in the grade of every diploma.

The effort of every college should be to apply athletics in some form to every student; even the crippled and deformed should receive private attention and instruction.

Athletics should be considered a department, absolutely essential, and not an excrescence or an expression of a supervital youthful energy.

They are indispensable to the colleges. They are a responsibility upon the colleges.

III. COMPETITION IN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

DUDLEY A. SARGENT, M. D., S. D., HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

No one who has observed the ways and habits of children can have failed to notice how much they enjoy all forms of physical activity. They seem to delight in the discovery that they can use their hands and feet in pushing, pulling and throwing, and in kicking, creeping and walking, and every addition to these simple movements brings a new pleasure to them. All through the period of youth and well along into adult years the gratification that comes to one in learning to swim, dive, skate, row, ride a horse or bicycle, dance, play ball or indulge in any new physical activity is distinct and unmistakable. It would seem that these were some of the methods afforded by nature not only to draw the boy out and to educate and develop him into a man, but to test him and to see how thoroughly the job was being done—in other words, to see how thoroughly he was alive. If later in life, as his powers mature, he has never experienced the exhilaration that comes from accomplishing some difficult ath-

letic or gymnastic feat, climbing a lofty mountain, swimming through the breakers, managing a boat in a squall, or engaging in some equally hazardous performance—he has not known the real joy of being alive from the crown of the head to the tips of the fingers and toes. The physical happiness and pleasure of living comes to us when all the senses are keen and alert, the heart beating vigorously, the lungs breathing deeply, and the blood circulating freely throughout the entire body. It is the natural accompaniment of a high degree of organic activity such as is usually associated with robust, vigorous health. Back of these physiological processes there may be deep-seated biological and psychological reasons for this pleasurable functioning of body and limbs such as are described by Darwin, Spencer, Karl Groos and other scientists. The fundamental reasons for this universal impulse to activity are summed up by these authorities under such general terms as “a natural or hereditary impulse,” “joy in being a cause,” “playful experimentation,” “internal struggle for existence,” “survival of the fittest,” “natural or sexual selection,” “adaptation to environment,” “egoism and altruism,” “individualism,” “socialism,” and other terms which cannot be considered in the brief time allotted to this paper.

Groos, in his book on “The Play of Man,” makes two distinctions in the natural or inherited impulse to activity which it is well for us to consider briefly. The first important distinction made is that between the impulses by which the individual wins supremacy over his own psycho-physical organism without regard to other individuals prominent in his environment, and the second distinction is where he wins supremacy over individual organisms of others, sometimes, as we shall proceed to show, without due regard to his own. To the first group belong the manifold impulses which issue in human activity, those controlling his sensory and motor apparatus. To the second group we assign the fighting and sexual impulses, imitation, and the social dispositions closely connected with these. Each of these impulses manifests its own peculiar play activity. In the first group of impulses we find such exercises as walking, running, jumping, swimming, climbing, dancing, etc., to which we have already alluded—where the individual may develop his powers and test his progress in efficiency. In the second group we find the antagonistic exercises, such as boxing, wrestling, and the familiar games of baseball, football, hockey, etc., where the individual strives to overcome the skill, strength and efficiency of others. In the first group the aim is physical perfection for its own sake; it forms the basis of a large part of the gymnasium training of the present day. In the second group the aim is to use the physically perfected organism in a contest or struggle with another, to see which is the better man, as the sporting phrase goes. In one case the indi-

vidual may compete against himself, or his own condition, from day to day; in the other case he must necessarily compete against an opponent, or against an opponent's record. These two groups of hereditary impulses, though apparently springing from different motives, are very closely related if not interdependent. Thus it is very difficult to conceive of an individual competing successfully as an athlete until he has perfected himself as a man. The organism must find a footing in the world before it can compete with rivals or struggle with antagonists. On the other hand the individual must have something of the fighting spirit of the athlete developed through the antagonistic impulses to enable him to hold himself down to the effort necessary to the attainment of the highest physical perfection. In other words, did time permit, we think that we should have no difficulty in showing that the primary or fundamental struggle in which we are all engaged is the so-called internal struggle for existence, or the competition of the tissues and organs. All parts must have their just share of the body's nutriment, and upon the amount received by the heart, lungs, stomach, muscles, brain, etc., will depend the balance and harmony of functions upon which health, strength and general efficiency depend. This is a matter which until recently has been left largely to chance, or to heredity. Now, through the efforts making in behalf of eugenics or race culture, our attention is once more being called to these fundamental factors in our development. A higher and better structure for all is what we are striving to attain, otherwise there could be no such thing as human progress. This is the standard by which all of our efforts towards individual or race improvement must be measured. Now let us see how these fundamental principles work out in practice. We have seen that there is a natural impulse to activity throughout the whole animal kingdom, that this activity was in a normal state pleasurable, and that the highest pleasure or joy of living was realized when we were breathing deeply, the blood circulating freely, and the organic hunger of the tissues was being satisfied. We saw further that under natural conditions plays, sports and games furnished the necessary activity for children and growing youth. But we are no longer living under natural conditions. The increase of the cities, the multiplication of schools, shops, stores and factories, have confined our youth more and more to an indoor and sedentary employment. Machinery now does the work once done by bone and muscle and there is little incentive for physical activity. The senses are dulled by the intensity and monotony of everyday life, and the simple plays and games of youth soon grow wearisome. But this inward craving of the tissues for activity still continues. How is this craving satisfied? By exercise, by stimulants, by emotional excitement and by in-

dulgence in the fighting and sexual impulses furnished through antagonistic sports and games. In my opinion, two thirds of the people who resort to stimulants, exciting amusements and spirited athletic contests have an inward yearning for a higher physiological condition which is temporarily attained by the increased action of the heart and lungs. The interest in antagonistic games and personal encounters harks back to the primitive ages when life or death and the possession of all that was held dear depended upon the result, and the ordeals passed through by our ancestors have been engraved upon the memory of every nerve and muscle cell of our bodies. This theory in a measure accounts for the horrible fascination which personal contests of all kinds have for both sexes. Every instructor in physical education knows that if he fails to arouse or sustain interest in his corrective or developing exercises he can always resort to a physical contest or a competitive game. To this sort of sport the dignified college professors, as well as the silliest school girls, will always respond. It matters very little at first what the nature of the contest is. The chief requisite is to bring two persons, groups or classes into competition. In college athletics as at present conducted competition is absolutely necessary. If there were no contests there would be very little practice of athletics as such, for athletics and competition in the minds of most students are synonymous terms.

ADVANTAGES OF COMPETITIVE ATHLETICS.

When a man enters as a competitor in any athletic event he feels challenged to do his best to win, as a loss of victory reflects upon his ability, and is injurious to his pride and self-esteem. In view of such a contest he is likely to prepare himself by careful practice and by adopting correct habits of living. If family, friends, class, school or college are interested he is likely to make increased efforts in their behalf. The real value to the individual competitor comes in self-discipline, the power to hold one's self down to a long period of routine work, the ability to summon all of one's energy and concentrate it upon the thing to be done, the object to be achieved, the feat to be accomplished. This might be termed the power of externalizing one's self. There is a joy and satisfaction in such a triumph which only those who have experienced it can realize. But there is another training that comes from athletics that is superior to that of developing one's individual powers. I refer to what is called team play. This is brought out in such games as basket ball, baseball, hockey, lacrosse and various forms of football, though opportunities to cultivate it are afforded in all kinds of school and college athletics. Team play not only gives one an opportunity for physical benefits, but

it has certain intellectual, moral and social advantages which one's individual efforts do not always supply. A full consideration of all these many-sided advantages of competitive athletics would take me too far afield for the purpose of this paper, and I must ask my hearers to supply them from their own observation and experiences. It should be stated, however, that team play may be equally advantageous to the individual, whatever be the motive of the team, or whether the object sought for be good or bad—as is sometimes revealed in football and machine politics.

Competitive athletics have many indirect advantages, such as furnishing wholesome recreation and amusements for large numbers of persons of both sexes, keeping them out in the open air, stimulating their struggling and fighting impulses, and giving them courage to meet their own trials and difficulties. The interest created by witnessing and reading about athletic contests gives schools and colleges an immense amount of free advertising that attracts students, and draws large gate receipts that in some institutions defray a large portion of the expenses for physical training, as well as athletics.

The *objection* to competitive athletics arises largely from their exaggerated importance and the excesses to which they are carried, especially in our colleges. As President Lowell says: "Competition provokes rivalry, intense rivalry gives rise to keen interest, and this in turn enhances the apparent value of the object for which the contest is engaged." It is a vicious circle and the evils grow by what they are fed upon. Where victory over a rival team or college is made the only standard of success, it is natural that everything should be done to secure victory. If rival teams have better athletes, coaches and trainers, spend more money for accessories, neglect college duties and devote more time to practice, the teams that would compete with them on equal terms must do the same. Thus arise the evils connected with gate receipts, professionalism, the employment of players, and the adoption of questionable methods that secure success. Competition in athletics to-day is a process of selection of the strongest and hardiest, upon whom are lavished all the care and attention of expert trainers, coaches and physicians, while those not good enough to make the teams secure little or no attention. Even from an athletic point of view this is not a commendable practice. The Harvard University football team has not infrequently had as many as twenty or thirty men engaged in coaching them through the season while the freshman team has usually but one and sometimes none, though I might add, the freshmen are more frequently victorious over Yale, their foremost rival, than the university team is. The vast majority of college students receive but little or no teaching or coaching in athletics. Each of the athletic associations at Harvard and Yale expends about \$100,000

every year upon the physical training of ten per cent. of the students to fit them for participation in athletic contests—while these great institutions expend less than one per cent. of their total income upon the physical training of the remaining ninety per cent. of their students to fit them physically for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. And yet there are those who think that physical training in our colleges is being overdone. The amusing, or shall I say the pathetic, part of it is that our students as a whole, like the Roman populace, are perfectly willing to accept this condition of things so long as they are fed upon athletic exhibitions and exciting contests. We have seen that witnessing or even reading about athletic contests causes an increased beating of the heart and repeated thrills of excitement—because they awaken old ancestral impulses that were developed through fighting, struggling, etc. That some satisfaction and some good results from being occasionally stirred up emotionally I am willing to admit, though it must be remembered for every one who experiences the joy of victory there is another one suffering the chagrin of defeat. What motor outlet is found for these feelings of alternate exhilaration and depression I must leave to my hearers to judge. But for a large portion of our college youth to be content to take their exercise vicariously—that is, by simply witnessing the physical efforts of others—is to me a humiliating condition. This is what is usually called supporting the teams. This is one of the evils of competition. For highly organized and intensely exciting games not only draw students away from the class room, but away from the gymnasium and milder forms of physical training and athletics. In this way an institution may come into competition with itself by throwing one department into antagonism with another. This might be warranted as a stimulus to greater activity but if applied to the gymnasium it would drive this institution to resort to the tricks of the vaudeville, the prize ring and the circus, all of which experiences it has passed through and outgrown in the interest of the average student. Not only are the different departments of a college thrown into antagonism with each other by this unbalanced and unduly exalted interest in athletic sports, but the colleges themselves are actually competing to see which one may produce the best specimens of this form of selection and expert training. But does competition in athletics carried to the excess to which they are now in our colleges tend to produce the highest types of men—men of whom the colleges with their traditions of culture and learning have reason to be proud? Not at all. One of the great evils resulting from the highly competitive athletics of to-day is the selection of the best man who can be found for a certain line of sport, and then confining him to this specialty. This may make a good runner,

jumper, pole vaulter, oarsman or football player, but it does not tend to develop the best type of a man, mentally, morally or physically. Because running, jumping, rowing and athletic games in moderation are excellent for health and development, it does not imply that the faster a man runs, the higher he jumps, the longer he rows or the harder he plays football, the better it will be for him. To attain the highest results possible in speed, strength or endurance is a step backward in human progress and reverts to a condition in which we have long been surpassed by many species of the lower animals. Man leads the rest of the animal kingdom in consequence of his superior mental ability, not as a result of his superior physical power. It is in recognition of this fact that we have schools and colleges. In order to stimulate youth to make the greatest mental effort possible, prizes, records and scholarships are offered, and these attainments are accepted as evidences of a superior brain. Here again the colleges resort to competition with the inevitable result. Students enter college well prepared in the classics or in mathematics, they choose electives in the same line of study, narrow themselves down to these specialties—and win prizes for intellectual distinction. In the meantime they neglect their physical education with its many-sided contact with nature, men and things—and in so doing they lose what no distinction in scholarship alone can ever replace. Moreover, by departing so far from the normal activities of life, social as well as physical, this class of students are contributing factors in making a high standing in scholarship not only unpopular, but to a healthy, normal boy seemingly undesirable. Thus we have two conditions in the American college to-day which in my opinion are anomalous. One is the tendency to extreme athleticism and the other the tendency to extreme scholasticism—and both conditions are greatly aggravated and intensified by the spirit of competition. In both classes the men who are brought to the front and who are regarded as the successful competitors under such a system are the very men who do not need this artificial stimulation, while the vast majority of the students who do need the physical and mental improvement that comes from increased activity are little affected by these highly specialized efforts. Indeed competition breeds a distaste for all activities in which the individual is not likely to excel, this stimulates competition in other subjects and events, and thus the evil multiplies. The college becomes a battleground of forces acting in different directions and often in antagonism with each other, so that the resultant measured in terms of human efficiency is not what the community has reason to expect.

Many of the advantages as well as many of the evils which I have mentioned in connection with college athletics are now quite generally recognized by college authorities. Hence the formation

of this organization. The problem is how to preserve the good and lessen the evils.

REMEDIES.

After some forty years' experience as a college instructor, medical examiner, and physical director I have come to the following conclusions: The primary essential in dealing with the athletic problems of to-day is the recognition on the part of our schools and colleges of the fundamental part which physical activities of all sorts play in the development of mind and body. The second essential is to recognize the two natural impulses to activity that I have already described—the impulse to self improvement and perfectability whereby the individual wins supremacy over his own psycho-physical organism—and the impulse to test this perfected organism by struggles with his fellows and his environment. The development of the organism should be largely the work of the schools, the testing of the power and efficiency of the organism is largely the work of the community at large. That the schools may discharge their full duty in perfecting the individual physically, ample facilities should be provided for the practice of gymnastics and every variety of plays, sports and games. These physical, or rather psycho-physical, activities should be made a part of the regular curriculum, taught by duly appointed and officially recognized instructors, and the work done should receive a certain amount of credit in the school standing of each individual pupil. The physical work, which is largely a matter of applied hygiene, should be frequently supplemented by practical health talks, and every effort should be made to apply the teachings of the chapel and recitation room to the work of the gymnasium and athletic field. The study of physiology, chemistry, physics, ethics and psychology, as well as history and the classics, abounds in opportunities to weave in valuable illustrations drawn from or applicable to youthful sports that show the interdependence of body and mind and make for the moulding of conduct and character. In order to keep up a sustained interest in gymnastics and athletics it will be necessary to resort to exhibitions and contests, but it is advisable to have as few of these spectacles open to the public as possible, the better plan being to make both athletics and gymnastics a personal matter with every student, and interest him in his own improvement rather than in his ability to out-do his fellows. Excellence in form, features, muscular development, brain power, circulation, respiration, digestion and every quality that makes for physical beauty and perfection should be objects of youthful emulation because the attainment of these qualities leads to individual as well as to race improvement. When the objective of competition

is some ulterior end like winning a contest or defeating some other person in struggling for a prize, then trouble begins, and greed, jealousy, anger, hatred, revenge and all the malevolent qualities of the mind that have kept the world in arms for centuries are fostered and developed. But some of you may say these are the emotions which make men fight and endure to the bitter end in a good cause and they must be tolerated even in our youth. The best way to hold these emotions in abeyance or to couple them with nobler qualities brought out in athletics is to arrange all contests in groups or classes and judge the result by the average attainment. This does away with the individual jealousy and envy engendered in striving for places on the team, enables the strong to help the weak, and the weak to contribute their part to the victory of the group. This method does away with the evils of overspecialization, increases the number of contestants and decreases the number of spectators. It develops comradeship, loyalty, generosity, good will and a spirit of mutual help and desire for coöperation. The group or class method of competition in my opinion opens up the most practical scheme of getting large numbers interested in athletics, and of doing away with many of the objections that so frequently accompany the individual method, or that carried on by highly organized teams.

I have spoken thus far of the regulation of athletics in the preparatory schools because these seem the most hopeful institutions in which to start a reform movement, because the pupils are younger, more susceptible to suggestions, and under better control of the authorities than the students in our colleges. The increased height and weight and the general improvement in physique now recognized in the young men upon entering college, are largely due to the excellent work that many of the preparatory schools are doing in physical training. It is also a tribute to the normal schools that have fitted these instructors for their life's work.

The introduction of the dormitory system of rowing at Harvard, in which some twenty crews compete, and the class and scrub football and baseball games, the class crews and class field and track sports that bring out a large number of competitors are all hopeful signs. There were 1132 certificates granted at Harvard last year, some men applying for two or more permissions to enter as competitors in some twenty different organizations for sport. But as most of these organizations are feeders for the university teams, and as the number of probable competitors is speedily reduced, only about ten per cent. survive for the final contests. The rest of the men are dropped from the "squad," as they term it, and nothing more is done for them athletically. If this method of selection were applied by the other departments of the university, ninety per cent. of all the men enrolled would be

dropped from the classroom after the promising scholars had been chosen. While the discovery of a Faraday, Darwin or Pasteur might warrant such a sacrifice in one institution, it would not warrant it in all, and the college professors would soon find themselves without a job if they attempted to apply the athletic principle of selection to their various courses. The discovery of a phenomenal ball pitcher, catcher, shot putter, or football team is of little or no service to the college as a whole or the community at large compared to the discovery of such men as those I have mentioned, and yet the whole machinery of our competitive athletic system is to discover the former and reject the latter, though the chances are that in the ninety per cent. who are dropped or not reached some "mute, inglorious Milton" or intellectual giant may be unrevealed. Now the remedy for this kind of competition with its attending evils is not less athletics, but more; not athletics for the selected few, but for the unselected many; not the finely specialized, highly organized forms of athletics in which only strong and vigorous men may participate, but the carefully selected simpler forms of physical exercise and competitive events in which the average student, who now sits on the benches and cheers the star athletes, may actually engage to his advantage. The crying need of the hour is not for more student athletes, but for more athletic students—men of brains and well-trained intellects who can back up their mental ability with strong, well-trained bodies, undaunted courage and indomitable wills. The only way that the non-selected student may be reached successfully is by making physical training and athletics a part of the regular curriculum, and by coupling the work of the gymnasium and athletic field with that of the laboratories, lecture halls and recitation rooms, in other words, by holding every student accountable for his physical and mental condition, as determined by a test of his physical and mental efficiency. This would do away with the present tendency of the scholarly student to neglect his athletics in view of improving his standing in his studies, and the tendency of the student athlete to neglect his studies in view of improving his standing in athletics. In this way one of the great evils of competition could be met, while many of the advantages of competition could be maintained for all classes of students by arranging group or class contests as already described. Such a plan seems to me the most successful of any that has hitherto been proposed or tried. To carry out such a plan successfully would necessarily cost a large sum of money, as it would call for the employment of a considerable number of salaried instructors and assistants. But as it is in the nature of constructive work or biological engineering for all classes of students it might reasonably be paid for from the college tuition or, better still, from a special endowment. An endowment for athletics would at once do away with the

demoralizing effects of gate receipts, silence the criticism of the college for running gladiatorial contests for the sake of making money, and give the authorities regulation and control of what should be an essential part of the educational system. The question at once arises, inasmuch as the college is now severely taxed to meet the payments for the so-called mental or literary instruction, why should not the money received for athletic exhibitions, games, etc., given under the auspices of the college be used for general instruction in physical training? Several colleges have already adopted this method and take complete charge of all the gate receipts in view of meeting their obligations for instruction in general gymnastics and athletics. The Harvard Athletic Association, under its present liberal management, pays out large sums of money annually to instructors whose services to a limited extent are shared by a considerable body of students who never make any of the athletic teams. But inasmuch as the tenure of office of all these instructors from the manager down depends largely upon their ability to turn out successful competitors in the athletic contests one may readily see that these instructors cannot afford to spend much time on unpromising athletic material, however much they may need the training for their personal improvement. Moreover if the college were to depend upon public patronage through gate receipts to meet the payment for the physical instruction which many think an essential part of a liberal education, the college would be committed to the very evils in the management of athletics which we all so much deplore. If the object is to make money by giving public spectacles, then our students will feel justified in making their contests as rough and exciting as the law will allow, for these kinds of sports are sure to appeal to the crowd and draw large gate receipts, while a refined exhibition would be given to empty benches. The great public may not know much about the fine points of a game, but they do know and feel a struggle or a fight when they see it, and as I have already shown, they receive a certain amount of physical and emotional satisfaction from witnessing such a contest. If again the standard of our athletics is to be determined by the size of the gate receipts they will be as difficult to reform as a theatrical production. "Give the fellows what they want" and "the public what it is willing to pay for," are not safe mottoes for any institution of learning to follow.

When athletics were doing their best work for ancient Greece, according to Professor Mahaffy, all the noble born youth, even those of ordinary strength, practiced the games. When athletics became too highly specialized and were given as spectacles for the entertainment of the populace, only the star performers or professional athletes took part and the young men looked on. This was the beginning of the decline

which ushered in the gladiatorial contests in Greece and Rome. Is history repeating itself? For we are now facing a remarkably curious situation. Every psychologist of good repute and all the physiologists, biologists and professors of pedagogy of note tell us of the importance of bodily activity and physical training as a basis for intellectual life; yet when we come to a consideration of relative values the body receives little attention in our colleges and universities comparable to that given to the mind, figuratively about one per cent. When we inquire for the reason of this apparent inconsistency we are told that it is due largely to the prejudices against the body created by the early Christians and priestly schoolmen in consequence of the brutal combats of the arena and the awful orgies of the Roman amphitheatre. Yet right under the walls of these very colleges and universities are frequently assembled a multitude of people of both sexes, young and old, who are drawn together not from their interest in physical training and not for their physical or mental improvement, but to experience the same sensations and emotions as those enjoyed by the Roman masses in witnessing the struggles and combats of the arena. In ancient times the human victims were usually prisoners or slaves; at the present time the victims may represent the best blood in the land and they are offered to the sacrifice by our institutions of learning. Why? Simply because we have allowed a good thing to go wrong. We have in football, at least, legalized foul play, and made it seem respectable. We have allowed the fighting impulse, represented by the spectacular side of athletics, to get the better of the educational and developmental side. In other words we have lost control. The people have experienced the excitement of combat, and crave for more, and are willing to pay for it. Here again the evils of competition are apparent. No college and no class of students thinks our athletics right as they are. Yet no college deems it expedient to institute a reform, for fear of losing popular patronage to its rivals, and no class of students dares take the initiative against too strenuous, if not too rough and unmanly sports, for fear of appearing to show the "white feather." Thus competition doth make cowards of us all, and sand and sense ~~part company~~. The way out of the difficulty seems to me very clear. Let me state it briefly by way of general summary. First, let us go back to elementary principles and consider that the impulse to develop and the impulse to struggle and strive are essential factors in the mental and physical education of youth. Let us recognize the claims of the well-trained mind as well as the finely trained body, and educate them both together in the same individual. Let us encourage competition as a stimulus to activity, but let us put a check upon competition when it is carried so far as to defeat the purposes for which it is employed. The

best check for overcompetition or overspecialization in one branch of athletics is a requirement of proficiency in other branches of athletics and a higher standing in studies; and the best check for overspecialization in single studies is the requirement of proficiency in other studies and a higher standing in athletics. This kind of competition leads to sanity and health preservation; our present method of competition leads to madness and destruction. Let us emulate the beautifully balanced ideals of the Greeks instead of the barbarous fighting standards of the Romans. Let us spend more time in developing the strength of the weak, the courage of the timid, and less time in exploiting the skill of the strong and the prowess of the daring. Let us educate the public to the real pleasure of exercising, acting and doing for themselves instead of the secondary pleasure of sitting and watching and feeling the struggles and emotions of others. Let us interest the public in sports and games which they and their children may play and enjoy, and not feed them on exciting contests that are beyond their powers, and which make the simpler sports and exercises seem tame and unprofitable. Then let us realize, in reviewing the rise and progress of nations, that the practice of athletics in which the many engage and the few look on makes for a vigorous people, while the practice of athletics in which the few engage and the many look on marks the beginning of their decadence.

Finally let the colleges, graduates and the public unite in assuming the responsibility for the unfortunate trend which this athletic movement has taken. Then let the educators so educate, regulate, modify and control, that all students will get some good from athletics, some students get less evil, or at least be protected from themselves, and some of their games saved from extinction. I see no way of accomplishing this desirable object, and doing away with the evils of athletics, except by making athletics a part of the curriculum, charging special fees for instruction and supervision, or raising an endowment to meet the necessary expenses.

IV. THE ESSENTIAL FACTORS IN THE CONTROL OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS.

J. H. MCCURDY, M. D., Y. M. C. A. TRAINING SCHOOL, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

This body represents the successful culmination of a number of attempts at faculty regulation of intercollegiate sport. When Harvard College engaged Charles Follen as instructor of German and superintendent of the gymnasium in 1826, the problem was

simple. He gave instruction in the gymnasium, regulated the play on the college playground, and astonished the farmer folks when he started with the entire college at his heels in single file for the top of Prospect Hill.

When President Stearns was inaugurated at Amherst College in 1854, he emphasized the need of bodily efficiency. The need was for the encouragement rather than the repression or regulation of physical exercise. In his first annual report in 1855 to the trustees he says: "No one thing has demanded more of my anxious attention than the health of the students. The waning of the physical energies in the midway of the college course is almost the rule rather than the exception among us, and cases of complete breaking down are painfully numerous." (*Physical Culture in Amherst College*, by Nathan Allen, M. D., Stone & Huse, Bookprinters, Lowell, Mass., 1869.) In his annual report for 1860, he said: "The faculty are of the opinion that exercises should be conducted in some such manner as the following: 1st, The main object shall be not to secure feats of agility and strength, or even powerful muscle, but to keep in good health the whole body. 2d, That all the students (unless there should be exceptional cases) shall be required to attend on its exercises for half an hour, designated for the purpose at least four days in the week. 3d, That the instructor shall assign to each individual such exercises as may be best adapted to him, taking special care to prevent the ambitious from violent action and all extremes, endeavoring to work the whole body and not overwork any part of it. 4th, That while it may not be expedient to mark the gradation of attainment as in the intellectual branches, yet regularity, attention and docility should be carefully noted so as to have its proper weight in the deportment column of the student's general position. 5th, That some time shall be allowed out of study hours for those volunteer exercises which different men, according to their tastes, may elect for recreation, and particularly that the bowling alleys be not given up to promiscuous use, but be allotted at regular hours to those who wish to make use of them; all these voluntary exercises, of whatever kind, to be conducted under the supervision of the gymnasium instructor. 6th, That the building shall always be closed before dark, that no light shall be used in it, and no smoking or irregularities of any kind shall be allowed in it. 7th, That the instructor (if a suitable person should be employed) ought to be a member of the faculty, and give in to it his marks and occasional accounts, and receive directions, as other officers of the college are accustomed to do. It must be obvious," he adds, "from this general view, that a teacher of very high qualifications will be demanded. With such a teacher we may be almost sure of success; with an inferior man our failure need not be foretold. What we need is a professorship which shall extend over the entire department of physical education."

Again he makes this statement concerning the character of the man needed: "As he would be much with the students and would be likely to have great influence over them, he ought to be a man of cultivated tastes and manners—a man of honorable sentiments and correct principles, having high aims and a Christian spirit. Such a man, with such a work as I have now marked out successfully pursued, would be an incalculable advantage to the college and to mankind. We should not only have the honor of being the first institution in the country which has ever sustained such a professorship, but we should probably save to the world a vast amount of physical and mental power which would otherwise be wasted."

On August 6, 1860, the Amherst trustees appointed Dr. John W. Hooker as professor in this department. He served only part of a year, due to ill health. Dr. Edward Hitchcock was elected professor of hygiene and physical education August 8, 1861, and has served continuously since that time.

Harvard's early attempts at the regulation of her student physical activities were desultory and irregular. The University of Virginia conducted a large outdoor gymnasium from 1852 until the outbreak of the Civil War. To Amherst College belongs the honor of consistently controlling the physical activities of her students since August 6, 1860. President Stearns, in his annual report for 1860, outlined the plan which has kept Amherst in the forefront in physical education matters from that day to this. He saw the need of faculty regulation of voluntary sport, that the business of the college was to make men, and that the first essential in a teacher in this branch of education was character. According to his idea he must be a leader among men, a man particularly with moral stamina, interested in the building up of manhood. Dr. Edward Hitchcock, professor of hygiene and physical education, during all these years, has been a personal embodiment to the students of what a Christian gentleman should be. The college has fortunately been small enough so that his work could take on more of a personal than of an administrative character. He has been the ideal of the undergraduate and of the alumnus. The active management of this department at Amherst in recent years has devolved upon Dr. Paul C. Phillips, an influential member of this conference and a member of your executive committee. President Stearns prevented most of the difficulties when he secured a man competent in training and character to head this department. He emphasized the fact that the work of the department of physical education should be for the mass of students; he also explicitly placed the control of voluntary exercises of whatever kind under the department of physical education.

Harvard University, among the larger institutions, represents the most clear-sighted and forceful policy for the regulation of

student physical activities from the administrative standpoint. President Eliot, in his annual report to the board of overseers for 1873-74, recognized the dangers of the students associating with professional athletes, the possibilities of over-emphasis of athletics by a portion of the student body, and the dangers of large gate receipts. (Harvard College Report upon Athletics, 1888, page 10.) In his Annual Report to the Board of Overseers, 1883-84, page 32, he saw clearly the social and moral relations of intercollegiate sport. He says: "The athletic sports ought to cultivate moral as well as physical courage, fair dealing and a sense of honor. If any form of unfaithfulness, unfairness or meanness is tolerated in them, they may become sources of wide-spreading moral corruption. If students do not find their sense of honor cultivated, they may be sure that their education is failing at its most vital point."

Baseball and football have been the chief causes of difficulty in intercollegiate sport, though boat races have come in for their share of criticism. In 1870 the Harvard 'varsity baseball nine played forty-four games, twenty-six of these out of term time, winning thirty-four of them. This took them on a tour throughout New York State, the South and the West. (Harvard College Report upon Athletics for 1888, page 10.) In 1882 the nine played twenty-eight games, eleven of them with professional clubs. Nineteen of these twenty-eight games were played outside of Cambridge. This led to the appointment of a faculty committee of five "to consider and report upon the subject of athletic sports and their relation to college work." (Harvard College Report upon Athletics for 1888, page 10.) They recommended to the faculty "that the president of the university should address the authorities of other colleges to secure and pass resolutions that the baseball clubs of their representative colleges should be forbidden to play with professional clubs." The other members of the Intercollegiate Baseball League were Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton and Amherst. All of these colleges except Yale were willing to prohibit games with professional clubs. (Harvard College Report upon Athletics for 1888, page 11.) This registered the first failure to secure coöperation in the regulation of intercollegiate sport.

President Eliot, in his Annual Report for 1883-84, page 32, said: "Football is played in such a brutal and dishonorable way that the faculty, after waiting two seasons to see if the players could not reform the game themselves, have been obliged to prohibit intercollegiate games of football altogether." This rule was not carried into effect. President Eliot's annual report to the board of overseers for 1884-85 says in substance: The committee on athletic sports decided football ought not to be played as early as the fall of 1883, but as the Intercollegiate Football Association

was to reform the game by very stringent rules, they waited until they had seen the rules under the new game. After attending four of the principal games, they reported to the Harvard faculty that "after deliberate investigation they had become convinced that the game of football as at present played by college teams is brutal, demoralizing to players and to spectators, and extremely dangerous." The faculty accordingly prohibited intercollegiate contests in football for 1885.

I will not take your time to follow the changes in regulation from this time. In the autumn of 1883 Harvard again tried to secure joint action in the control of intercollegiate sport, and they "sent a formal letter to the faculty of Yale College" requesting them if they agreed with their committee on the necessity of joint action to "call a conference at New Haven of delegates from the leading colleges for the discussion of the matter of intercollegiate athletics, and for the consideration of action to be taken jointly." (Harvard College Report of Athletics for 1888, page 13.) Yale declined to call such a conference. The Harvard committee then called a conference in New York, December 28, 1883. The institutions represented in this conference were Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, Williams, Trinity and Wesleyan. There were twelve delegates, including three college presidents. After a thorough discussion, a committee of five was appointed to prepare a plan for joint control of intercollegiate sport. They presented the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That every director or instructor in physical exercises or athletic sports must be appointed by the college authorities, and announced as such in the catalogue.
2. *Resolved*, That no professional athlete, oarsman, or ball player shall be employed either for instruction or for practice in preparation for any intercollegiate contest.
3. *Resolved*, That no college organization shall row, or play baseball, football, lacrosse, or cricket, except with similar organizations from their own or other institutions of learning.
4. *Resolved*, That there shall be a standing committee, composed of one member from the faculty of each of the colleges adopting these regulations, whose duty it shall be to supervise all contests in which students of their respective colleges may engage, and approve all rules and regulations under which such contests may be held.
5. *Resolved*, That no student shall be allowed to take part in any intercollegiate contest as a member of any club, team or crew for more than four years.
6. *Resolved*, That all intercollegiate games of baseball, football, lacrosse, and cricket shall take place upon the home grounds of one or other of the competing colleges.
7. *Resolved*, That no intercollegiate boat race shall be for a longer distance than three miles.
8. *Resolved*, That the students of colleges in which these resolutions are in force shall not be allowed to engage in games or contests with the students of colleges in which they are not in force.

A second conference was called with delegates reporting from Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, Wesleyan, Dartmouth, Amherst, Lafayette and Rutgers. These resolutions were discussed. They were then sent to the faculties of twenty-one colleges, with the agreement that they would become binding when adopted by five colleges. These resolutions were adopted by only Harvard and Princeton.

The failure to secure joint regulation of intercollegiate sport at this time was a serious blow to the best development of intercollegiate sport. The excesses which have characterized intercollegiate sport since that time might have been greatly minimized by the organization of this board of joint control. The organization of your Intercollegiate Association at the football conference December 28, 1905, constituted the biggest step yet taken toward intercollegiate joint control of athletics. The success of this Association has been made possible by the splendid coöperation of the universities of the South and Middle West, and by the colleges generally throughout the United States. An organization without a definite purpose would have failed without the coöperation of such institutions as Harvard, Yale and Princeton. Its success is splendid evidence of the urgent need, and of the discreet and forceful manner in which the organization has been managed. This organization has studied the problems of sport in relation to the moral, social and physical needs of young men. It has legislated with discretion. The organization of the football rules committee which should amalgamate with the old committee, or if this proved impossible, formulate rules of their own, was a strategic move. The instructions to the committee were to secure (a) an open game, (b) elimination of rough and brutal play, (c) definite, precise rules of play, (d) the organization and control of officials.

The essentials in the regulating and control of the inter-relations of amateur sport are, first, a local committee in each organization or institution, who see clearly the relations of sport to the needs of men; men who see the opportunities for physical, moral and social development in sport; men whose lives pulsate with a keen desire to help young men relate their deepest interests to rational living; men with time to devote to helping students to employ profitably their recreation time. This committee in college should be composed of faculty and student members. The faculty members should be men who see in this committee one of their largest opportunities for influencing college life; men of sanity, discretion and enthusiasm, who have the confidence of the student body. The student members should be men who see college sport in relation to the needs of the entire student body to character building. I have not put alumni members on the committee, as it seems to me the men willing to serve are too often

of the sporty type. I recognize, however, that some of the most valuable committee members have been among the alumni members. The success of such a committee depends on two things: (1) administrative control of sport; (2) the control of all instruction. The administrative control under the faculty of all matters of an athletic nature would include:

(a) The determination of eligible men in relation to scholarship, health and amateur standing.

(b) The practice and playing season for each team. Such problems would be decided as the number of games to be played, the character of the schedule, pre-season training.

(c) Financial management. All money received should go through the athletic treasurer. All money paid out should be by check on receipt of itemized bills.

(d) Team managers and captains should be responsible to this committee for the general conduct of their respective teams.

An organization of this character must have an administrative head. In the smaller colleges the professor of physical education might act as secretary of this committee. In the larger institutions they might have an athletic director, a graduate treasurer, and a secretary, all paid members of this committee, or all of this work might be handled under the athletic section of the department of physical education. The spectacle of the large universities expending \$50,000 to \$75,000 on athletic sport each year, and showing a variation in the football expenses between two succeeding years of over \$12,000, is an indication of the need of administrative supervision.

(2) Instruction. This committee, or the department of education, should control all instruction. It has been shown beyond doubt that alumni or professional coaches responsible for putting out a winning team too often work the men beyond all reason, and use methods which would not be sanctioned by either faculty or undergraduate sentiment. They are put in a false position. They are practically told to put out a winning team or get out. I do not believe in a team being an easy loser, but it ought to be a generous loser after the men have done the best they can. The money received for the conduct of athletics wisely expended might furnish physical instruction to every student in the college. Harvard University's athletic receipts varied between \$106,000 and \$125,000 during the four years from 1903 to 1906 inclusive.

The second essential in amateur sport is intercollegiate organization committees for the control of matters related to their competition. This intercollegiate organization should represent the best elements in intercollegiate sport. Its officers, legislative and rule-making committees should place the development of manhood above the development of sport. This organization should work for three things:

(1) The improvement of the conditions of intercollegiate competition regarding amateurism and play with professionals, elimination of pre-season training, reduction of training table expenses (or better, their elimination), length of schedules, etc.

(2) The control of playing rules in football, baseball, basketball, track and other sports. The rules-making committees should consist of official delegates from their respective institutions. While I believe in the exception made in the formation of the football rules committee, I believe the policy is wrong and that all committees should be made up of men who are officially responsible to the institutions from which they come. The rules should be made with the definite idea of meeting the physical, moral and social needs of the institutions and individuals represented.

(3) They should furnish a list of competent officials. This organization deserves great credit for the work that has been done in this particular during the last few years.

The third essential is an advisory national committee made up of official delegates from the various organizations promoting athletics. This would include representatives from this body, from the Amateur Athletic Union, the Young Men's Christian Associations, the Playground Association, and any other national bodies interested in the promotion of sport for the betterment of men. This committee through its representatives would report back to their respective organizations regarding all joint endeavors which might be undertaken to improve sport for the individual, and give a better national play life.

V. COURTESY AND SPORTSMANSHIP IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS.

PROF. THOMAS F. MORAN, PURDUE UNIVERSITY.

The subject which has been assigned to me for this morning's program is altogether to my liking. With all due allowance for the very natural tendency to "dignify mine office," this subject appeals to me as the most important one now under discussion in the present perturbed state of intercollegiate athletics. It is vastly more important than the forward pass or the quarter-back kick, for the reason that without courtesy and a high standard of sportsmanship intercollegiate contests cannot continue to justify themselves either to the authorities and patrons of our colleges or to the intelligent and thinking public.

There is a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction in our colleges at the present time upon the subject of intercollegiate athletics

in general and football in particular. It cannot be denied that there is a feeling of suspense in the football situation. The game as it was played last season is on trial. Many thoughtful and otherwise conservative men are saying that the game does more harm than good, as now played in our colleges. This condition of affairs should cause the friends of intercollegiate athletics to pause a moment and seek the reasons for this antagonism. We can no longer ignore these criticisms. I say "we" because I take it that every man at this meeting is an enthusiast for college sport of the proper kind. We all delight in a strenuous, manly, sportsmanlike intercollegiate contest, and for that reason we should be zealous in protecting intercollegiate athletics from all influences of a harmful character. Those of us who are here are not, I am sure, interested in any kind of athletics but the clean and manly sort, and are far-sighted enough to see that no other kind will be tolerated for any considerable length of time in our American colleges.

Let us attempt an analysis of the present situation and discover, if we can, wherein the real difficulty, if such there be, lies. After the season of 1905 a great cry was raised against football in all parts of the country. Long lists of fatalities and serious injuries were published and the game was denounced in editorial columns and elsewhere as a brutal contest and unfit for college men. College faculties and associations of college professors arraigned the game and demanded its reform or abolition. For a time the fate of the game hung in the balance. Then the rules committee came to the rescue and revised the playing rules of the game. A great improvement was apparently made. Injuries were decreased both in number and in severity, the new game was declared more interesting than the old, and, on the whole, "new football" was received with no little favor. The problem seemed for the moment to be solved, but in reality it was not. For a season or two all went well; then injuries to players began to increase, and now the outcry against the game is just as loud as it was four years ago and apparently more determined. Again relief is demanded from the rules committee and that body is being very severely criticised in some quarters. A college professor said to me not long since that this rules committee was playing fast and loose with the college authorities and seemed reluctant to inaugurate any real reforms in football. I do not believe that this sweeping criticism can be justified. Four years ago the rules committee did inaugurate a real reform in football but the work of the committee has since been nullified by the professional coach and the game is now fully as objectionable as it ever was. It was thought for a time that the mass play and other engines of destruction had been eliminated from the game, but the skill of the professional coach soon found a way to reintroduce them.

For this reason it seems to me that that criticism is short-sighted and superficial which lays the whole blame for present evils at the door of the rules committee. The coach, under present conditions, in his eagerness to "develop" the game will nullify, in the course of two or three seasons, the most salutary reforms which any rules committee can inaugurate. If the rules head him off at one point he will reappear at another. Let us not forget that it was largely through his efforts that Rugby was "developed" into the present "American game" which is now well-nigh intolerable. Rugby is being played with great success in England and on the Pacific coast of the United States, while our "improved" American game is on trial for its life. If, then, we would elevate our intercollegiate athletics in matters of courtesy and sportsmanship we must go beyond the rules committee—which is by no means blameless—and consider our coaching systems.

The worst possible system of coaching, judged by its results, is that one which has been quite generally prevalent throughout the West of hiring a professional coach for the football season only. Such a man is a mere bird of passage. He is here to-day and away to-morrow. He is almost entirely irresponsible. He has no sympathy with the scholastic ideals of the institution and is interested usually only in winning games. He feels that he must win in order to retain his position and his prestige. This is unfortunately true in too many instances and herein the public opinion in many of our colleges is grievously at fault. If he is fortunate or skillful enough to win an unusual number of important games, a more prominent position at a larger salary awaits him. So win he must, and if he hasn't the material at hand he does what he can to procure it. In his desire to win he will go to almost any length. He will drive his men with curses up and down the field, dope them with stimulants on occasions, teach them to "hold," to slug, and to injure an opponent by unnecessary roughness. He does not open his eyes to the fact that in killing off a player he is in reality killing off the game. He will also conceal as long as he can the ineligibility of a player and urge the man to lie in order to retain his position on the team. "They all do it," he says, "and we must do as the others do." He will coach the team from the sidelines and will not hesitate to gain a point in any way. The words "courtesy" and "sportsmanship" are not in his vocabulary and there is no use in talking about such matters while the average ten weeks' coach is in our midst. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule. Men of high character have served as short-time coaches, but such instances are all too rare.

The alumni system is better in many respects than the one just described. The alumnus will, as a rule, have some thought for the good name of his alma mater. He will be familiar with her

traditions and sympathetic to some extent at least with her scholastic ideals. He will be acquainted with the officers of the university and familiar with their views on college sport. In innumerable ways he will be preferable to the ten weeks' coach who is an alien in the college community and whose aims and objects are totally at variance with the views of those men who have the real and permanent interests of the institution at heart. If a good type of man can be secured, the alumni system of coaching has much to commend it. But here is the rub. The greatest difficulty is found in procuring the right kind of men. The great majority of men of high character (and there are many such) who play the game will not, except in a few instances, devote their time and energies to football after graduation. They go into business and into the professions and leave the coaching of teams, for the most part, to men of lower moral standards. I realize that there are some notable exceptions to this rule but the rule still obtains nevertheless.

The plan involving the appointment of a man for the entire year and perhaps for a term of years to coach the football and other teams has been used with conspicuous success in many institutions. Such a man is a fixture, not, a transient. Even though not an alumnus of the college his interests are bound up with the interests of the institution. He is a part of the college community and is interested in putting athletics on a sound and wholesome basis. He is usually a member of the instructional corps and as such has a feeling of responsibility. He is also as a rule a higher type of man than the temporary coach, and takes a broader view of athletic problems. His teams, however, are brought into competition with those coached by unscrupulous men and he is tempted to do things which he would not think of doing under other conditions. Under such circumstances he has too often yielded. He has lowered his standards. While in Rome he feels that he must do as the Romans do. He must fight fire with fire. In a word, the high-minded athletic director has too often descended to the plane and used the methods of the short-time professional coach. The results are obvious.

It is apparent then that no system of coaching now in vogue in our colleges is wholly satisfactory from the standpoint of good sportsmanship. This being the case, let us carry our analysis a step further and seek the causes. Much blame has been laid upon the shoulders of the coach as an individual and in most cases no injustice has been done him. And yet if we would seek the underlying cause of the difficulty we must examine the environment in which the coach is compelled to do his work. Here are conditions which explain if they do not excuse his shortcomings. He does his work, in too many instances, under the pressure of a perverted public opinion. The undergraduate insists upon a winning team.

He calls upon the coach to produce it. In the choice of methods he is not particularly fastidious. If the coach resorts to underhanded work or unsportsmanlike methods the average undergraduate, on the surface at least, seems to think it a very good joke. The alumnus also calls upon the coach for a winning team, and the general public, patronizing the game by the tens of thousands and appreciating the spectacular side only, clamors for victory. In some instances, the college president, with the advertising bee in his bonnet, deems victory indispensable and is content to be densely ignorant of the means employed to obtain that end. In the midst of this insane desire to win at any cost is it to be wondered at that the professional coach, with a wobbly and adjustable code of morals to begin with, should resort to unsportsmanlike methods to win his games? In the ultimate analysis then an unwholesome and perverted public opinion must bear a large part of the burden of the responsibility for the present evils in intercollegiate athletics.

If this be true, what is the remedy? To my mind the undergraduate is the key to the whole situation. If you can convince him that courtesy and sportsmanship should obtain in intercollegiate athletics to a greater extent than is now the case, he will do the rest. He is a reasonable being and is open to conviction, if you can get at him, on any reasonable proposition. On the surface he may appear to be a happy, thoughtless, happy-go-lucky sort of chap who has a few miscellaneous notions about things in general but no settled views on any serious subject. On closer acquaintance, however, we find that he has a good fund of common sense and will usually land on the right side of any proposition which has been presented to him in a reasonable way. The difficulty lies in the fact that those men who advocate high standards of courtesy and sportsmanship do not, in large universities, come into intimate contact with the undergraduate, and as a result his ethical education is left largely in the hands of the professional coach and the few noisy extremists who are always in evidence in the student body.

I should think then that an appeal to the common sense of the undergraduate body would be the best and most practicable method of raising our standards of courtesy and sportsmanship. I have witnessed during the past year two or three instances of sportsmanlike conduct on the part of bodies of students which might well make any man proud of his connection with any one of the colleges involved. An appeal was made to the students of the opposing institutions and the response was instantaneous, manly and gratifying. It is along this line that we must hope for progress. College faculties have passed certain rules which have done some good, but rules superimposed from above do not always foster a spirit of courtesy and sportsmanship. If we had

such a spirit, all of our written regulations might be abolished. Personally, I regret the necessity of any such rules whatever, and I hope that I may see the day when intercollegiate contests will be governed by one single unwritten law only—the law of honor. This may seem a Utopian dream, but the undergraduate with the coöperation of the alumni and faculty can make it a reality. We need then a closer sympathy and a more cordial coöperation with the students of our various colleges. Most of us, either because of temperament or the necessities of a large institution, are too far removed from the world in which the undergraduate lives and moves. With a close acquaintance and mutual understanding, nine tenths of our difficulties would disappear.

Now what can the undergraduate do to elevate intercollegiate athletics? In the first place he can frown upon, or even rebel against, the disreputable practices of the professional coach. He can refuse to play "dirty ball" even when commanded to do so. He can be honest in matters of eligibility and not be a professional in the guise of an amateur. He can make his word as good as his bond and respected of all men. He can adhere to the training rules laid down for his guidance, and he can in most cases, if he wishes, keep up in his studies.

So much for the participant. Now for the general student body. A right public opinion among the students would not countenance unsportsmanlike practices of any kind. It would not tolerate professionalism or any other form of deception or falsehood. It would set its face sternly against slugging and against any discourteous, unfair, or underhanded treatment of an opponent. It would not tolerate the violation of training rules, and would look upon the negligent "flunker" as a sinner rather than a martyr. And when a man has been removed from an athletic team for professionalism which he had hitherto carefully concealed, a wholesome and healthy public opinion in the student body would resent the humiliation to the college and the injury to the team and would not allow such an act of dishonesty and disloyalty to go unrebuked. In a word, a wholesome public opinion in the student body would remove practically every difficulty from the present athletic situation. Personally, I have great hope that this will be done.

Reforms in the playing rules and more particularly in the ethics of the game will be resisted by certain classes of men. The "sport" and the "rough-neck" have no sympathy with any reform movement. They become facetious when reform is mentioned and make sarcastic references to tiddledewinks, pink teas and Sunday schools, although precious little they know about the latter. They even threaten to "slap you on the wrist," whatever that may mean. The reporter who "moulds public opinion" on the sporting page of the daily paper will also in many cases be

found in the opposition. He is too often irresponsible and immature and interested only in exploiting the college for the sake of his page. I am sure that I am violating no confidence when I say that he is not in every case a stickler for truth and accuracy. His "pipe dreams," particularly in the dull season, are numerous and unreliable and when read by the uninitiated have done an infinite injury to intercollegiate sport. When you call for volunteers for the reform army, the "sport" and the "rough-neck" will not answer, "Here am I." But you may expect the hearty coöperation of the level-headed undergraduate, the seasoned alumnus, the college authorities and, most of all, of the parents of our college boys. I sincerely hope that the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States will take a guiding hand in this movement. We need to get back to the simple life. We are too highly "developed." If I had my way about it I would have no coaching at all in football except that by the captain of the team and his more experienced men. Such mutual disarmament on the part of competing colleges in any given locality would be wholesome. I would retrace my steps in the direction of Rugby and would attempt to make football a game instead of a battle. I would try to make it an exhilarating form of recreation instead of an intolerable species of drudgery as it often is. I would also try to revise some of the current ideas in regard to the game. It may be good football to direct a ponderous mass play against an injured and weakened player, but it is mighty poor sportsmanship. Of course the man who takes a firm stand on these things will be the target for flippant and facetious remarks. But it is worth while. The game is worth the candle, and the leaders in this movement are certain to have a respectable following. Our athletic men and athletic associations should take the lead. No man can call himself a true friend of intercollegiate athletics who does not at this time stand unequivocally for honesty, courtesy, and a high order of sportsmanship in our contests.